

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 7, 1992

The House met at 10 a.m.

Rev. Thomas Kuhn, pastor, Church of the Incarnation, Centerville, OH, offered the following prayer:

Lord, on this National Day of Prayer we are reminded that we are not simply a country, but "one nation under God."

Your love for us is obvious. May our lives reflect that love.

Your love has made us a powerful people. May we always be gentle, to lift up the fallen, and strong, to protect those who cannot defend themselves.

Your love has given us an abundant land. May we always share our abundance with those who cannot care for themselves.

Your love for us has made us truly free. May we work so that all our brothers and sisters, enslaved by prejudice, may be free.

Leadership and vision have been entrusted to this House. May our Representatives work for the good of all Your children. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 262, nays 122, answered "present" 1, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—262

Abercrombie	Anthony	Bellenson
Ackerman	Applegate	Bennett
Alexander	Archer	Berman
Anderson	Aspin	Bevill
Andrews (ME)	Atkins	Bilbray
Andrews (NJ)	Bacchus	Blackwell
Andrews (TX)	Barnard	Bonior
Annuzio	Bateman	Borski

Boucher	Hoyer	Pelosi
Brewster	Hubbard	Penny
Brooks	Huckaby	Perkins
Browder	Hughes	Peterson (FL)
Brown	Hutto	Peterson (MN)
Bryant	Jefferson	Petri
Bustamante	Johnson (CT)	Pickett
Campbell (CO)	Johnson (SD)	Pickle
Cardin	Johnston	Poshard
Carr	Jones (GA)	Price
Clement	Jones (NC)	Pursell
Coleman (TX)	Jontz	Rahall
Collins (MI)	Kanjorski	Ravenel
Combest	Kaptur	Ray
Condit	Kasich	Reed
Conyers	Kennedy	Richardson
Cooper	Kennelly	Rinaldo
Costello	Kildee	Ritter
Coyne	Klecza	Roemer
Cramer	Kopetski	Rose
Darden	Kostmayer	Rostenkowski
DeFazio	LaFalce	Rowland
DeLauro	Lancaster	Roybal
Derrick	Lantos	Russo
Dicks	LaRocco	Sabo
Dingell	Laughlin	Sangmeister
Dixon	Lehman (CA)	Santorum
Donnelly	Lent	Sarpalius
Dooley	Levin (MI)	Sawyer
Dorgan (ND)	Lewis (GA)	Scheuer
Downey	Lipinski	Schulze
Durbin	Lloyd	Schumer
Dwyer	Long	Serrano
Dymally	Lowe (NY)	Sharp
Early	Luken	Shaw
Eckart	Manton	Sisisky
Edwards (CA)	Markey	Skaggs
Edwards (TX)	Martinez	Skelton
Engel	Matsui	Slaterry
English	Mavroules	Slaughter
Erdreich	Mazzoli	Smith (FL)
Espy	McCloskey	Smith (IA)
Evans	McDermott	Smith (NJ)
Ewing	McGrath	Solarz
Fascell	McHugh	Spence
Fazio	McMillen (MD)	Staggers
Fish	McNulty	Stallings
Foglietta	Mfume	Stark
Ford (MI)	Miller (CA)	Stenholm
Ford (TN)	Mineta	Stokes
Frank (MA)	Mink	Studds
Frost	Mollohan	Sweet
Gejdenson	Montgomery	Swift
Gephardt	Moran	Synar
Geren	Morrison	Tallon
Gibbons	Mrazek	Tanner
Gillmor	Murtha	Tauzin
Gilman	Myers	Taylor (MS)
Glickman	Nagle	Thomas (GA)
Gonzalez	Natcher	Thornton
Gordon	Neal (MA)	Torricelli
Gradison	Neal (NC)	Towns
Green	Nichols	Trafigant
Gunderson	Nowak	Traxler
Hall (OH)	Oakar	Unsoeld
Hall (TX)	Oberstar	Vander Jagt
Hamilton	Obey	Vento
Hammerschmidt	Olin	Visclosky
Hansen	Oliver	Volkmer
Harris	Ortiz	Waxman
Hatcher	Orton	Weiss
Hayes (IL)	Owens (NY)	Wheat
Hayes (LA)	Owens (UT)	Whitnen
Hefner	Packard	Wise
Hertel	Pallone	Wolpe
Hoagland	Panetta	Wyden
Hochbrueckner	Parker	Wyllie
Horn	Patterson	Yates
Horton	Payne (NJ)	
Houghton	Pease	

NAYS—122

Allard	Baker	Barton
Allen	Ballenger	Bentley
Armey	Barrett	Bereuter

Bilirakis	Herger	Rhodes
Bliley	Hobson	Ridge
Boehert	Holloway	Riggs
Boehner	Hopkins	Roberts
Bunning	Hunter	Rogers
Burton	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Callahan	Inhofe	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Jacobs	Roth
Chandler	James	Roukema
Clay	Kolbe	Saxton
Clinger	Kyl	Schaefer
Coble	Lagomarsino	Schiff
Coleman (MO)	Lewis (CA)	Schroeder
Coughlin	Lewis (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Cox (CA)	Lightfoot	Shays
Crane	Livingston	Shuster
Cunningham	Lowery (CA)	Sikorski
Davis	Machtley	Skeen
DeLay	Marlenee	Smith (OR)
Dickinson	Martin	Smith (TX)
Doolittle	McCandless	Snowe
Dorman (CA)	McCollum	Solomon
Dreier	McCrery	Stearns
Duncan	McDade	Stump
Emerson	McEwen	Sundquist
Farwell	Meyers	Taylor (NC)
Fields	Michel	Thomas (CA)
Franks (CT)	Molinar	Thomas (WY)
Galleghy	Moody	Upton
Gekas	Moorhead	Vucanovich
Gingrich	Murphy	Walker
Goodling	Nussle	Walsh
Goss	Oxley	Weldon
Grandy	Paxon	Wolf
Hancock	Porter	Young (FL)
Hastert	Quillen	Zelliff
Hefley	Ramstad	Zimmer
Henry	Regula	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Broomfield

NOT VOTING—49

AuCoin	Gilchrest	Payne (VA)
Boxer	Guarini	Rangel
Bruce	Ireland	Roe
Byron	Jenkins	Sanders
Campbell (CA)	Johnson (TX)	Savage
Carper	Klug	Spratt
Chapman	Kolter	Torres
Collins (IL)	Leach	Valentine
Cox (IL)	Lehman (FL)	Washington
Dannemeyer	Levine (CA)	Waters
de la Garza	McCurdy	Weber
Dellums	McMillan (NC)	Williams
Edwards (OK)	Miller (OH)	Wilson
Felgus	Miller (WA)	Yatron
Flake	Moakley	Young (AK)
Gallo	Morella	
Gaydos	Pastor	

□ 1024

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, May 7, 1992, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote No. 108, approval of the Journal. I would like the RECORD to show that had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on official business during rollcall vote No. 108 on Thursday, May 7, 1992. Had

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

I been present on the House floor I would have cast my vote as follows:

Rollcall, No. 108—"yea" on the Chair's approval of the journal.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LUKEN] kindly come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LUKEN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2507) "An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes" disagreed to by the House and agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. DURENBERGER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce that he will take up to seven 1-minute statements from each side of the aisle. Other 1-minute statements will be entertained later in the legislative day.

THE REVEREND THOMAS KUHN

(Mr. LUKEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise for a moment today to welcome Father Tom Kuhn, our guest chaplain, to the Chamber. I came to know Father Kuhn when he was a principal at Elder High School in the western part of Hamilton County for about 8 years.

He has now moved a little north in Ohio to Centerville where he is pastor of the Incarnation Parish, and he leads a delegation of students from that school who are with us this morning.

I will put a more extensive history about Father Kuhn in the RECORD, but suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, he has devoted his life to the service of God and to his fellow man.

I would also like to thank the Chaplain and the Speaker for making his trip here a memorable one.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce Father Thomas Kuhn of Cincinnati, who has delivered today's invocation.

Father Kuhn, a Roman Catholic priest, has been pastor of Incarnation Parish in Centerville, OH, since 1989.

After his ordination in 1967, Father Kuhn began teaching religion and physics at Elder High School, a Catholic school for young men, in the archdiocese of Cincinnati, OH. In addition, he also served as chaplain for many of the athletic teams at the school. Because of his dedication to the school and his students, he was named vice principal of Elder in 1972.

In 1976, Father Kuhn was named copastor of St. Vincent DePaul Parish located along the Ohio River. He served in this capacity until 1982, when he departed to devote himself full time to Elder.

Having been named principal of Elder High school in 1981, Father Kuhn took over the daily operations of the school and its 1,200 students. Despite the demands of this role, he continued to serve as an associate pastor at St. John's Parish in Westchester, OH. He remained principal of Elder High School, as well as teacher of senior physics through the 1987-88 school year.

After a brief sabbatical in 1988, Father Kuhn was named to his present position as pastor of Incarnation Parish in Centerville, OH.

It is with great pleasure that I introduce to you Father Kuhn.

THE REVEREND THOMAS KUHN

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleague from Cincinnati, Mr. LUKEN, in welcoming to the House, Father Tom Kuhn. While he was in Cincinnati and before he arrived in Centerville, OH, he spent several years living in our community in Westchester, OH, and was assistant pastor of our church.

Father Kuhn brought to our church, and I think can bring to a lot of churches in America a very unique quality, and that quality was to have a 5-minute sermon where Father Kuhn would bring a point to bear, and would relate it to a personal experience. In all of my years of going to church and listening to sermons, actually the next day I would remember his sermon.

He is a very dear friend. He has many friends in our community, and I join with my friend from Cincinnati in welcoming him here for the invocation that he gave this morning.

PROTECTING THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

(Mr. MINETA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, as Members know, I have taken this time in the past to talk with our colleagues about the need for Congress to serve our constituents by ensuring that Federal agencies designed to help citizens have the resources to do so.

Last week, we were assured by various officials that Social Security trust funds are not in jeopardy, and that Americans need not worry about unfunded benefits.

We must do more than not worry, Mr. Speaker.

Just as Congress guarantees adequate funding for Social Security, we must also ensure that Social Security offices answer their telephones, meets with our constituents, and responds to their needs in a timely fashion.

Millions of our senior citizens depend upon Social Security to make ends meet here and now. When someone's Social Security payment gets hung up in bureaucracy, they cannot cash in an excuse—whether legitimate or not.

The promise of reliability rests at the core of our system. In other words, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing secure about Social Security unless we make the system live up to that promise.

With respect to disability claims, for example, people are waiting longer and longer to have their claims processed—people who desperately need these benefits to survive.

In my home State of California alone, the backlog of disability cases is so overwhelming that on average it takes 5 months just for an initial review.

At the same time, people who should be taken off disability support are still receiving benefits because of the lack of regular case review.

Mr. Speaker, the reality is that when we shortchange the implementation of our Social Security benefits, we waste taxpayers time and money.

For every dollar spent on reviewing claims, \$4 would be returned to the trust fund in benefits paid out unnecessarily.

Mr. Speaker, it is our job in Congress to cut the fat from excessive Government spending—not vital constituent services.

Americans suffer every time we try to be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

□ 1030

GET TOUGH WITH MILOSEVIC

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this is not the time for our Government to disengage from Yugoslavia. Those who want to build a new world order must work to end the tragedy of Bosnia, not run from the ongoing crisis there.

Slobodan Milosevic the last Marxist strongman in Europe, is destroying Bosnia the way he took apart Croatia. His raw aggression has resulted in hundreds of people killed, 600,000 refugees, and shameful destruction.

We should coordinate our efforts with our allies and do everything possible to

isolate Milosevic and his regime both politically and economically.

Our Government must continue to work to exclude Serbia from the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and other international institutions. We should strongly encourage other nations to deny recognition to the new Serbian state.

We must work with our friends to bring down the economic roof on Serbia by imposing serious international sanctions on that pariah state. We should restrict Serbia's access to its assets, and suspend loan guarantees.

Perhaps it is time to answer the Bosnian leader's pleas and send an armed U.N. force to stop the massacre of innocent people there. How will history judge us if we sit still while the Serbian army ravages that republic?

Mr. Speaker, we have no choice but to stay involved and get tough with Milosevic.

TIME FOR THE BLAME GAME IS OVER

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am announcing to the House today my intention to begin organizing a society to protect the name of our Founding Father, George Washington.

I noticed that the White House has been, for the last 12 years, blaming Jimmy Carter for all of the country's problems. They now, last week, blamed Lyndon Johnson for the problems associated with the Los Angeles riots, and I am sure before the election campaign is over, they will be finding fault with Andy Jackson, Thomas Jefferson, and George Washington. I think we probably need to start now organizing to protect the reputation of those gentlemen.

It also seems to me that we need to face the fact that the time for the blame game is over. If you want to know why Los Angeles happened, it happened, yes, because of a bad jury verdict; yes, it happened because of outright criminality; yes, it happened because of racism. But it also happened because this country, for the last 12 years or more, has seen the income of regular people in this country steadily decline, decline, decline.

Until we do something about economic growth, we are going to see this happen not just in Los Angeles but in a good many other places around the country.

WE SHOULD NOT BE FINGERPOINTING

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today I stood in this well in the wake of the Rodney King verdict and said, among other things, that I was somewhat embarrassed to be a Representative from southern California.

Well, by Saturday, I was very proud, very proud because of a tremendous rebuilding effort which started in south central Los Angeles and the other areas that were hit.

We have seen Peter Ueberroth, Richard Riordan, and volunteer citizens from the San Gabriel Valley, the San Fernando Valley, and, yes, the Simi Valley come into south central Los Angeles and work on this rebuilding.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has just contended that what the President said should not exist; we should not be fingerpointing.

Yesterday afternoon the President, before he left for Los Angeles, said that we should not be pointing the finger. We should come together to work to rebuild.

We want to see a successful resolution to all of these problems that exist, and I congratulate those who worked so diligently to begin making it happen.

THE OHIO FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the Ohio free trade agreement would exempt Ohio from all Federal regs, laws, and taxes. Think about it. Ohio companies would have to pay no unemployment comp, no workmen's comp, no OSHA, no EPA, no bank regulations, no labor regulations, no minimum wage, no Social Security, no IRS. Think about it. Fat City in Ohio. Job Heaven in Ohio.

Companies from Indiana, West Virginia, Michigan, will be speeding across the border opening up manufacturing plants in Ohio. That is right. You have heard about NAFTA. I have submitted OFTA, folks, Ohio free trade agreement.

If you wonder why all of the jobs are moving to Mexico, look at my bill, and let me tell you something, Congress had better wake up, because the American people want a job, and they do not want to move to Mexico to get the damn thing.

IN SUPPORT OF H.J. RES. 430, DESIGNATING MAY 4-10, 1992 PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to have the opportunity to recognize the thousands of dedicated,

hard-working, Americans who unselfishly give of themselves in service to their neighbors, their communities, and their Nation—the men and women who compose our Nation's public service.

I sincerely believe that the American public is privileged to be served by the finest public servants in the world, and this fact should be remembered every day, not just during Public Service Recognition Week. From sewers to space shuttles, from sidewalks to subways, and from food inspection to border protection, public servants help make America work. It is through their efforts that we as citizens of this great Nation have the opportunity to enjoy and prosper from the protections, services, and resources that public servants provide.

Civil servants are the unsung heroes who maintain the necessary daily services that keep our Nation safe and sound. Civil engineers, teachers, and law enforcement personnel, just to name a few, build our roads and bridges, educate our children, and keep our streets secure. In a broader sense, public servants ensure our national security, provide relief to the needy, and protect our fragile environment. Without these vital services, the economic vitality of the United States would be at risk.

In addition to vital day-to-day services, public servants give U.S. industry an edge in the increasingly competitive global high technology marketplace. Public servants provide the vital research base for private industry to develop and apply new technologies in the areas of aerospace, environmental protection, health care, and nuclear energy. As a result of their contributions, American companies produce high technology products that are the envy of the world. Americans enjoy the modern conveniences of these spinoff technologies including lightweight metals and fabrics, computers, fiber optics, bar coding technology, and CAT scan machines to detect cancer.

More importantly, however, public servants play a vital role in ensuring the future of America and the American way of life. The integrity of a nation relies largely on the quality of its public service. As we turn to focus on the many challenges facing our cities and towns, civil servants will be called upon for leadership. It will take professionalism, creativity, and teamwork to meet this Nation's needs in education, housing, transportation, infrastructure, and the environment. In each of these areas public employees will play a major role. Without a quality civil service, the basic democratic and constitutional principles on which this Nation was founded would begin to unravel. I believe public servants are one of our Nation's most valuable national resources, and we must strive to ensure

the United States is afforded a high quality, high performance public work force.

As a Representative of over 75,000 public employees, and a former Federal worker myself, I am proud to be a co-sponsor of House Joint Resolution 430 to designate the week of May 4-10, 1992, as "Public Service Recognition Week." I believe it is important to raise awareness about the many important civic and national responsibilities associated with public service. I am hopeful this resolution, along with the many events and expositions planned across the country, will prompt citizens to reflect on the many contributions made by these individuals. I also hope that this week's festivities will generate interest in public service as a career opportunity for people looking to make a difference in their community and in their Nation.

BRING JOBS BACK TO THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. APPELATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. APPELATE. Mr. Speaker, President Bush now wants to level some more blame. The answers to the L.A. problems: He says that all the people want is a piece of the action.

Where has he been? His tax and trade policies have encouraged the action to leave the country for the very same reason that my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], just said, Jobs and businesses are on their way out of the country. But instead he wants to blame the liberal policies of the 1960's.

Now, which ones does he want to blame, problems helping the older Americans, our young, our sick, our poor, or the ones who want to get educated? Who is he kidding?

I think the President has to come out of his ivory tower and come down to see what the real world is all about and show the leadership he was elected to do.

The rich are getting richer, and the rest are getting stuck with the blame.

Yes, a piece of the action is what it is all about, my friends, but bring our jobs back to the United States, and I am sure that is going to solve a lot of problems.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO NAME NEW FEDERAL COURTHOUSE IN RENO, NV, AFTER LATE JUDGE BRUCE R. THOMPSON

(Mrs. VUCANOVICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to name the new Federal courthouse and Fed-

eral building in Reno, NV, after the late Judge Bruce R. Thompson.

Judge Thompson, former senior U.S. district judge, died on February 10, 1992. Nominated to the Federal bench in 1963, Judge Thompson was appointed by President John F. Kennedy to the bench and assumed his duties on August 30, 1963. Admitted to the Nevada State Bar on October 2, 1936, he served as president of the bar from 1955 to 1956.

Judge Thompson served as the only active judge of the court in Reno until he assumed senior status on August 31, 1978. After taking senior status, and until the time of his death, Judge Thompson continued to maintain a civil caseload for the court.

The courthouse is currently in the design phase, and with funds being appropriated this year by Congress, construction is scheduled to begin within the year.

Judge Thompson, a lifelong resident of Reno with strong family roots, was a vital part of the legal and civic communities in the area. The absence of his presence is being sorely felt, and I believe that this tribute to his memory is most fitting.

THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP TO LOS ANGELES

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, this morning the President is in Los Angeles for what I fear will be more of a photo opportunity than a factfinding mission.

It is regrettable that it took 58 deaths and millions of dollars of damage to get our President to finally focus on our cities.

In 4 years as President, George Bush has never bothered to tour the urban blight that lies a scant four blocks from his door. He has never visited rundown areas of my city, New York, to see firsthand the impact of a decade of neglect on America's cities.

Mr. Speaker, while simply throwing money at problems will not solve the cities' problems, neglect punctuated by an occasional photo opportunity surely will not either.

We have to give a hard look to education, jobs, and, most of all, to the deterioration of family and see what the solutions are. If the President thinks the problems of the 1960's are to blame, which programs would he have us repeal, and which ones would he put in their place?

Mr. Speaker, 58 people had to die before George Bush noticed our dying cities. I only hope that his hindsight interest will not fade when grass has grown over their graves and the fires of L.A. stop smoldering.

□ 1040

THE DEMOCRAT RESCISSION PACKAGE

(Mr. ZELIFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic rescission bill is proof positive, that we need individual votes on each proposed budget cut, Mr. Speaker.

The President, following the law and our House rules, proposed a large number of budget cutting rescissions. The House leadership, following its usual partisan political gamesmanship, will not even let us vote on the individual budget cuts, proposed by the President. The Democratic leadership want us to vote on a combined package of rescissions, in a kind of take it or leave it basis.

The great majority of the President's budget cuts make sense, and if the Democratic leadership would let them come to the floor, for individual votes, I would vote for them. Likewise many of the Democratic proposed rescissions make sense, and if we could cast individual votes on them, many would have my support.

Unfortunately, the Democratic rescission package, instead of focusing on pork barrel projects, continues their usual political games, and includes a \$4 million dollar cut in the vital low-income home energy assistance program, that is so important to helping recession ridden New England get through each winter season. Let us have individual votes on these budget cuts, Mr. Speaker, so that we can separate the pork from the prime programs that have worked so well for so many in need of our assistance.

INTRODUCTION OF TELECOMMUTING ACT OF 1992

(Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I introduced the Telecommuting Act of 1992. This bill will create an Office of Telecommuting in NTIA, and will provide funding for five telecommuting centers in the greater Washington, DC, area.

Generally speaking, telecommuting includes working out of the home or at satellite telecommuting offices, using computer modems, fax machines, telephones, and other technologies to tie the employee into his central place of work.

The immediate benefits include reductions in traffic congestion, fuel consumption, and air pollution, while enhancing productivity, lowering operating costs, and allowing more time to be spent with one's family.

Furthermore, the potential of telecommunicating for rural America is

staggering. By freeing the employee from working at a single specified site, and closing distances through technology, economic development is not bound by conventional means. This could breathe new life into rural America.

This bill is a necessary step in developing the use of telecommunicating locally and nationwide; it's an idea whose time has come.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO AMEND ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

(Mr. CHANDLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act. The purpose is to restore balance in this very important law and to put people, families, and communities, an equal footing with our very legitimate concern for the environment.

In the Pacific Northwest, we have seen thousands of working people, men and women, thrown out of their jobs because of the Endangered Species Act.

There is potential for much more hardship to come.

The Endangered Species Act is inflexible. It largely ignores economics. It requires recovery efforts, even when it does not make sense, and it has become a tool for radicals.

My bill is balanced. It also includes jobs and people in the equation. It is flexible and it is based not on radical notions of what we ought to do with the environment, but rather on common-sense concern for plants, animals, and people.

INTRODUCTION OF DEFENSE DIVERSIFICATION AND COMMUNITY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1992

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the Defense Diversification and Community Adjustment Act of 1992 to help facilitate the diversification of defense-related business and assist dislocated defense workers. The changes in the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and throughout the world, have forced Members of Congress and the President to reevaluate where the lines on defense spending will be drawn. There are Members of Congress who believe that all of the Defense moneys that we save should be spent on domestic needs. They call this the peace dividend. Frankly, I believe there is no peace dividend for a worker who is handed a pink slip because of a canceled contract or closed plant.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we need to utilize some of the projected savings to offset the hardships that businesses and workers in-

involved in defense production will experience. This money would be better spent on these businesses and workers now, not later. If we continue to wait and address the need when these workers are unemployed, the economic and social costs will be extensive.

My legislation takes a two-track approach to help businesses and workers. It would enhance the Pentagon's Office of Economic Adjustment by adding a new Assistant Secretary of Defense to spearhead the defense conversion process. My bill would also expand the eligibility requirements of the Job Training Partnership Act to assist in the retraining of highly skilled defense workers.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I introduced today attempts to improve upon many programs which we already have in place. I believe this approach will be the most cost effective and also provide relief to dislocated workers in a timely manner. We need to act now to provide an effective response to any future cuts in defense. We have to act responsibly and constructively for our communities, our businesses, and our workers to provide appropriate diversification and adjustment assistance. I urge my colleagues to examine the issues involved and to lend their support to this urgently needed legislation.

REAPPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF AMERICAN FOLKLIFE CENTER IN LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(b) of Public Law 94-201, the Chair reappoints from private life the following members to the Board of Trustees of the American Folklife Center in the Library of Congress on the part of the House:

Mrs. Nina M. Archabal of St. Paul, MN; and

Mrs. Judith McCulloh of Champaign, IL.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4990, RESCINDING CERTAIN BUDGET AUTHORITY

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 447 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 447

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4990) rescinding certain budget authority, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the bill and against its consideration are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and which shall not exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment

printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as having been adopted. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except the amendments printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Said amendments shall be considered in the order and manner specified in the report of the Committee on Rules, and shall be considered as having been read. Each shall be debatable for not to exceed thirty minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a member opposed thereto. Said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules are hereby waived. If both amendments in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules are adopted, only the latter amendment which is adopted shall be considered as finally adopted and reported back to the House. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit which shall not contain instructions.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 1017 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 shall not apply to a bill or joint resolution introduced with respect to any special message transmitted under section 1012 of that Act on March 10, 1992, March 20, 1992, or April 8, 1992.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully make a point of order against the resolution on the grounds that it violates clause 4(b) of House rule XI, and I ask to be heard on my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 447 provides in the last sentence of section 1:

and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit which—

And this is the point I wish to make—

which shall not contain instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the language prohibiting any instructions in the motion to recommit clearly violates clause 4(b) of House rule 11 which prohibits the Rules Committee from reporting "any rule or order which would prevent the motion to recommit from being made as provided in clause 4 of rule 16" of the rules that we live under in this House.

And clause 4 of rule 16 provides at the relevant part that—

After the previous question shall have been ordered on the passage of a bill or joint resolution one motion to recommit shall be in order, and the Speaker—you—shall give preference in recognition for such purpose to a Member who is opposed to the bill or joint resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take your time or the time of this House to re-

count the detailed history of these two rules and the precedents behind them. I have previously given that to you and to the Members of this House in the form of a 48-page, documented historical report, which you have, so I will not bother repeating it.

Suffice to say, prior to 1909, the House already had a motion to recommit, with or without instructions, contained in at that time rule 17. Clauses 4 of rule 11 and 16 were added to the rules by a minority party member, a Democrat from New York, my State, to give the minority a right to get a last vote on its proposition through recommitment instructions.

That is clear from the author of that amendment to the rules and numerous Speakers upholding that right in the following years.

The key phrase in clause 4(b) of rule XI is "as provided in clause 4 of rule 16," since what was being provided for in that new rule was the right of the minority to offer a final amendment in the form of instructions.

□ 1050

If the Speaker will consider logic alone, for the majority to dictate in a rule such as this what form the motion to recommit should take—in this case only a straight motion to recommit—is to truly deny the opponent of the bill recognized under the rule, a motion of his or her choosing. This now becomes a majority motion, and not a minority motion.

And that is what is happening here today.

When I previously raised similar points of order, the Chair has referred to a 1934 ruling of Speaker Rainey that the Rules Committee need only allow for a straight motion to recommit to satisfy that rule.

And as I previously argued, Mr. Speaker, and argue again today, that ruling, and all subsequent rulings of this and previous Speakers which relied on it, were wrongly decided.

And any logical person would come to that conclusion.

To limit the minority to a straight motion to recommit, to deny it the original intent of the rule, guts that right and nullifies the original intent of the rule. There is no longer a need for two motions to recommit under our rules.

It was my understanding that the Speaker was at least willing to consider that ruling and had agreed to have the Rules Committee—that I serve on—look into the matter further. Ironically, that long-promised hearing was held just yesterday, the very same day that this rule, this unfair rule depriving the minority, was reported. The Rules Committee has not yet issued a final report on its study, and yet here we are again today being denied our traditional right to offer instructions. We are being disenfranchised.

Mr. Speaker, instead of quoting Speaker Gillett or any number of other Speakers who have upheld our rights, or your rights if you were in the minority, to offer instructions in the past, let me close by quoting to you from Thomas Jefferson in his Manual, which is still a part of our rules. He said: "So far the maxim is certainly true and is founded in good sense, that as it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons, the only weapon by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceedings which have been adopted as they were found necessary from time to time, and are become the law of the House," the law of the House, "by a strict adherence to which the weaker party can only be protected from those irregularities and abuses," and I will repeat those words, "be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check," and have been intended to check for over 200 years in this House, "and which the wantonness of power is but too often apt to suggest to large and successful majorities," which you have the privilege of having 101 more Members than we have on this side.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us strips the minority of all of its rights and does not allow us to offer even one amendment which we had requested—not in the Committee of the Whole and not in the motion to recommit. This is exactly the kind of example against which Jefferson warned us in which the minority has been stripped of the only weapon and protections we have to defend against attempts by those in power, and I will repeat again, "irregularities and abuses," which in recent years seems to be the norm around here and is one of the reasons I am ashamed to say that this House is held in such low esteem by the American people. Ten percent approval or something like that in the latest polls.

If you take away this last ounce of protection that the minority has under our rules to offer even one amendment, even one amendment through the motion to recommit, you have rendered us helpless and you have rendered the value of any rules in this House absolutely meaningless.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you are the Speaker of this House, you represent the majority, and as you should because you are a Member of that party, but you also have an obligation, a constitutional obligation, to represent the minority as well, and I strongly urge you to take a courageous step, Mr. Speaker—we have great respect for you—and to rule in our favor under this point of order. It means a lot to the American people, and it certainly means a lot to minority interests around this country.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry to have taken so much time.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK].

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York makes the point of order that the rule limits the motion to recommit and, therefore, according to the minority, the rule violates clause 4(b) of rule XI.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully disagree. Rule XI prohibits the Rules Committee from reporting a rule that: "Would prevent the motion to recommit from being made as provided in clause 4 of rule XVI."

Clause 4 of rule XVI addresses the simple motion to recommit a bill or joint resolution and requires the Speaker to give preference in recognition to a Member of the minority who is opposed to the measure. Nowhere are instructions mentioned.

The Rules Committee, therefore, may report a rule that limits but does not prohibit the motion to recommit—without violating clause 4(b) of rule XI.

Mr. Speaker, so long as a simple motion to recommit can be offered, a rule does not "prevent the motion to recommit from being made as provided in clause 4 of rule XVI." This is a well-established parliamentary point since Speaker Rainey's decision in 1934.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary point was reaffirmed by recent rulings of the Chair on October 16, 1990, on June 4, 1991, on November 25, 1991, and on February 26, 1992. On those occasions certain Members sought to appeal the ruling of the Chair. The House then voted, on each occasion, to sustain the ruling by tabling the appeal. The House thereby strengthened the precedents in this interpretation of the rule.

Without an intervening change in the rule, there can be no question of the interpretation. Mr. Speaker, the precedents are clear and unequivocal. Moreover, the House has spoken on several recent occasions to reaffirm this position. I urge the point of order be overruled.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, might I be heard in rebuttal?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, without taking up a great deal of the committee's time, Mr. BUTLER DERRICK of South Carolina has really made the argument that I made, that, yes, those decisions were made, they were unjust at the time, and certainly we have the right to turn it around the same as our U.S. Supreme Court has that right, and we ought to do it here today. I would urge you to rule in favor of our point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, the precedents are clear, dating from 1934,

from Speaker Rainey on forward, in a number of decisions that were made by this House in the last 2 years. Therefore, I would implore that the Speaker overrule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair notes that the gentleman from New York has pointed out that there have been repeated objections to rules which have not contained, as a matter of right, a motion to recommit with instructions, that the matter has been undertaken for review by the Committee on Rules, that a hearing has been held but a final study or report from the Committee on Rules has not yet been concluded.

Because of the pendency of such a review, but because of the lack of any other conclusion thereon which might recommend against the existing line of precedents, the Chair is constrained to rule, as he has ruled before, that under the precedents of October 16, 1990, and February 26, 1992, both of which the gentleman correctly points out stem from a precedent of January 11, 1934, by Speaker Rainey, the Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, you know of the great respect I have for you, and I am always constrained to ever appeal the ruling of the Chair because I personally think that you do try to be fair.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is unfair. We certainly are being deprived of our opportunity to even have a substitute of our own choosing, and because of that I just respectfully have to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] appeals the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the appeal of the ruling of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK].

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 161, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—253

Abercrombie	Andrews (NJ)	Aspin
Ackerman	Andrews (TX)	Atkins
Alexander	Annunzio	Bacchus
Anderson	Anthony	Barnard
Andrews (ME)	Applegate	Beilenson

Bennett	Hertel	Payne (VA)
Berman	Hoagland	Pease
Bevill	Hochbrueckner	Pelosi
Billbray	Horn	Penny
Blackwell	Hoyer	Perkins
Bonior	Hubbard	Peterson (FL)
Borski	Huckaby	Peterson (MN)
Boucher	Hughes	Pickett
Brewster	Hutto	Pickle
Brooks	Jacobs	Poshard
Browder	Jefferson	Price
Brown	Jenkins	Rahall
Bruce	Johnson (SD)	Rangel
Bryant	Johnston	Ray
Bustamante	Jones (GA)	Reed
Campbell (CO)	Jones (NC)	Richardson
Cardin	Jontz	Roe
Carper	Kanjorski	Roemer
Carr	Kaptur	Rose
Chapman	Kennedy	Rostenkowski
Clay	Kennelly	Rowland
Clement	Kildee	Roybal
Coleman (TX)	Kleczka	Sabo
Collins (MI)	Kopetski	Sanders
Condit	Kostmayer	Sangmeister
Conyers	LaFalce	Sarpalius
Cooper	Lancaster	Savage
Costello	Lantos	Sawyer
Cox (IL)	LaRocco	Scheuer
Coyne	Laughlin	Schroeder
Cramer	Lehman (CA)	Schumer
Darden	Levin (MI)	Serrano
de la Garza	Lewis (GA)	Sharp
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sikorski
DeLauro	Lloyd	Sisisky
Dellums	Long	Skaggs
Derrick	Lowey (NY)	Skelton
Dicks	Luken	Slatery
Dingell	Manton	Slaughter
Dixon	Markey	Smith (FL)
Donnelly	Martinez	Smith (IA)
Downey	Matsui	Solarz
Durbin	Mavroules	Spratt
Dwyer	Mazzoli	Staggers
Dymally	McCloskey	Stallings
Early	McCurdy	Stark
Eckart	McDermott	Stenholm
Edwards (CA)	McHugh	Stokes
Edwards (TX)	McMillen (MD)	Studds
Engel	McNulty	Swett
English	Miller (CA)	Swift
Erdreich	Mineta	Synar
Espy	Mink	Tallon
Evans	Mollohan	Tanner
Fascell	Montgomery	Tauzin
Fazio	Moody	Taylor (MS)
Foglietta	Moran	Thomas (GA)
Ford (MI)	Mrazek	Thornton
Ford (TN)	Murphy	Torricelli
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Towns
Frost	Nagle	Trafficant
Gaydos	Natcher	Traxler
Gedensson	Neal (MA)	Unsoeld
Gephardt	Neal (NC)	Vento
Geren	Nowak	Vislosky
Gibbons	Oakar	Volkmer
Glickman	Oberstar	Washington
Gonzalez	Obey	Waxman
Gordon	Olin	Weiss
Guarini	Oliver	Wheat
Hall (OH)	Ortiz	Whittem
Hall (TX)	Orton	Williams
Hamilton	Owens (NY)	Wilson
Harris	Owens (UT)	Wise
Hatcher	Pallone	Wolpe
Hayes (IL)	Panetta	Wyden
Hayes (LA)	Parker	Yates
Hefner	Patterson	
	Payne (NJ)	

NAYS—161

Allard	Boehlt	Cox (CA)
Allen	Boehner	Crane
Archer	Broomfield	Cunningham
Armey	Bunning	Davis
Baker	Burton	DeLay
Ballenger	Callahan	Dickinson
Barrett	Camp	Doolittle
Barton	Chandler	Dornan (CA)
Bateman	Clinger	Dreier
Bentley	Coble	Duncan
Bereuter	Coleman (MO)	Edwards (OK)
Billakis	Combest	Emerson
Billie	Coughlin	Ewing

Fawell	Lent	Roberts
Fields	Lewis (CA)	Rogers
Fish	Lewis (FL)	Rohrabacher
Franks (CT)	Lightfoot	Ros-Lehtinen
Gallegly	Livingston	Roth
Gallo	Lowery (CA)	Roukema
Gekas	Machtley	Santorum
Gilchrest	Marlenee	Saxton
Gillmor	Martin	Schaefer
Gillman	McCandless	Schiff
Gingrich	McCollum	Schulze
Goodling	McCrery	Sensenbrenner
Goss	McDade	Shaw
Gradison	McEwen	Shays
Grandy	McGrath	Shuster
Green	McMillan (NC)	Skeen
Gunderson	Meyers	Smith (NJ)
Hammerschmidt	Michel	Smith (OR)
Hancock	Miller (OH)	Smith (TX)
Hansen	Molinar	Snowe
Hastert	Moorhead	Solomon
Hefley	Morella	Spence
Henry	Morrison	Stearns
Herger	Myers	Stump
Hobson	Nichols	Sundquist
Hopkins	Nussle	Taylor (NC)
Horton	Oxley	Thomas (CA)
Houghton	Packard	Thomas (WY)
Hunter	Paxon	Upton
Hyde	Petri	Vander Jagt
Inhofe	Porter	Vucanovich
Ireland	Pursell	Walker
James	Quillen	Walsh
Johnson (CT)	Ramstad	Weldon
Johnson (TX)	Ravenel	Wolf
Kasich	Regula	Wyllie
Klug	Rhodes	Young (AK)
Kolbe	Ridge	Young (FL)
Kyl	Riggs	Zeliff
Lagomarsino	Rinaldo	Zimmer
Leach	Ritter	

NOT VOTING—20

AuCoin	Flake	Pastor
Boxer	Holloway	Russo
Byron	Kolter	Valentine
Campbell (CA)	Lehman (FL)	Waters
Collins (IL)	Levine (CA)	Weber
Dannemeyer	Miller (WA)	Yatron
Feighan	Moakley	

□ 1123

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Pastor for, with Mr. Holloway against. Mrs. Collins of Illinois for, with Mr. Miller of Washington against.

Mr. OLIN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 447 is a modified rule-making in order the consideration of H.R. 4990, a bill to rescind certain budget authority for fiscal year 1992. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority mem-

ber of the Appropriations Committee. The rule waives all points of order against the bill and against its consideration.

The rule incorporates an amendment reported from the Appropriations Committee. This amendment approves the President's April 8 rescission proposal rescinding \$144,000 for the Office of the Federal Inspector for the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System.

The rule makes in order two amendments printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment is debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and Member opposed, and is not subject to amendment. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments and provides that they will be considered under a "king-of-the-hill" procedure. Under king-of-the-hill, if more than one amendment in the nature of a substitute is adopted, only the last such amendment adopted shall be considered as finally adopted and reported back to the House.

The rule also provides for one motion to recommit without instructions. Finally the rule provides that section 1017 of the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 shall not apply to a bill or joint resolution introduced with respect to any special message transmitted under section 1012 of that act of March 10, March 20, or April 8, 1992.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow the House to consider H.R. 4990, a bill to rescind certain budget authority for fiscal year 1992. On March 10, March 20, and April 8 the President submitted to Congress a total of 99 individual rescission messages proposing to reduce fiscal year 1992 budget authority by \$5.662 billion.

On April 29 the Appropriations Committee reported a rescission bill taking into consideration the President's proposals as well as numerous proposals developed by Members of the House.

It has generally been the practice of the Appropriations Committee to address rescissions in its annual appropriations or supplemental appropriations bills rather than reporting single purpose rescission bills. In this case, however, the committee decided the current situation justified the reporting of a rescission bill.

H.R. 4990 would rescind \$5.804 billion in 1992 budget authority, which is \$142 million more than the President proposed. Of the \$5.804 billion rescinded by H.R. 4990, \$2.57 billion was proposed, in whole or in part, by the President. The bill rescinds \$123 million in foreign affairs appropriations as well as \$20 million from the legislative branch.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 447 is a carefully crafted rule that will speed consideration of this important rescission legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues back in their offices, as well as the press, listen up. I have seen some blatantly partisan slam-dunk rules here in this Chamber over the last 14 years, but this one shatters the backboard. This is a disgrace. Not since 1981 has the majority stooped to such chicanery as is evidenced by this rule.

My colleagues will recall that in 1981, in the debate on the reconciliation bill, the Democrat leadership and their minions on the Committee on Rules wrote the minority substitute for the minority by picking and choosing from those various amendments the minority had actually requested. On that occasion this House had the good sense to defeat the previous question and adopt a fair rule. Forty good Democrats came over and voted against that unfairness, remember? Many of those Members are still here.

Today we have the exact same situation. The minority is not being allowed even one amendment which we requested, not one. As a matter of fact, not even one Democrat is being allowed any amendment that was requested.

□ 1130

Instead, the majority has written a substitute for someone who is not specified in the report to accompany this resolution that sets up some kind of king-of-the-hill procedure between the Appropriations Committee bill as one substitute and one substitute offering the President's rescissions. In other words, we cannot vote on both of them together, only separately.

I would repeat for the benefit of my colleagues back in their offices that nobody on our side of the aisle or from the bipartisan "pork busters" group, made up of Democrats and Republicans, even asked for such a substitute. Instead, the requests made in the Rules Committee were to add further rescission amendments to the committee bill, not to substitute anything for it.

My colleagues, if those amendments had been allowed to be offered, the House would have a change to vote for \$12.2 billion in rescissions instead of being confronted with voting for either a \$5.8 billion committee substitute or a \$5.7 billion substitute offered by an anonymous Member.

In the Rules Committee, we offered amendments to this rule to implement the requests of our leadership and to implement the requests of the bipartisan pork busters group. Every one of those motions was defeated, Mr. Speaker, on a party line vote.

I really wish Members would listen carefully to this because it really is a disgrace. We offered an open rule to allow any and all germane amendments. That is the process called for under the Budget Act for Presidential

rescission bills. The Democrats voted to disenfranchise every single Member of this House and the 250 million Americans they represent. The Democrats voted to disregard the Budget Act's amendment procedures and to totally disregard the rules of this House.

Second, we offered a motion to delete the provision in section 2 of this rule that removes the expedited consideration of each of the President's rescission bills. Preserving that right is important if we are to give conferees on this bill some kind of an incentive to reach an agreement on a bill that the President can sign. Once again, the Democrats voted to violate this important provision of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act. They voted to violate the law and to violate the rules of this House.

Third, we moved to make in order the bipartisan pork busters amendment to add both the \$5.4 billion in Presidential rescissions and \$1.3 billion in rescissions from the pork busters bill to the committee bill, for a total savings of \$12.2 billion. The Democrats on the Rules Committee voted to deny the House a chance to more than double the savings and reduce the deficit by that amount.

Do Members know what happened? Six Democrats, only six Democrats, after having turned off the lights on C-SPAN, shutting them off the air and kicking out the broadcast news media, voted in the dark to gag the other 429 Members of this House, preventing them from voting on these key issues that mean so much to the American people. That is right. That is what six Democrats did to the other 429 of us, including 260 or so of the Speaker's Members.

Fourth, we moved to allow the offering of an amendment to add \$1.5 billion from the pork busters bill to the committee bill. Now what is so unreasonable about that? But the same six Democrats in the same darkness blocked that amendment from reaching the floor for a vote. We are not going to vote on it today because we cannot.

Fifth, we moved to make in order the \$5.4 billion from the President's rescission packages that were not included in the committee bill. What do Members think happened? I am ashamed to even stand up here and say this, but these same six Democrats in the same blackout blocked any consideration of that vote. So Members cannot even represent their people back home.

Sixth and seventh, we moved to make in order two amendments that I filed with the committee for the second time this year, amendments to give the President of the United States of America line item veto rescission authority either on a permanent basis or as a pilot program for the coming 1993 budget. Both of these amendments were shot down in flames as well. By

whom? The same six Democrats who are afraid to let Members vote for the line-item veto on this floor because we all know what would happen. The American people want it, and this House would pass it, but six Democrats will not let it come to the floor.

Eighth, we moved to make in order amendments by Representative CARPER, a Democrat, and CHARLIE STENHOLM, a Democrat, to provide for expedited rescission procedures for the next 2 years, similar in concept to my line-item veto but watered down considerably. Still it is a strong step in the right direction. That Democrat amendment was rejected. By whom? The same six Democrats who are gagging the House.

Mr. Speaker, given this sequence of events, I know why the Rules Committee Democrats on Tuesday and again yesterday voted to deny my motions to televise our committee deliberations on this bill. They do not want the American people to see just how rotten things have gotten around here with this blatant demonstration of how the arrogance of power has corrupted this House.

The majority who runs this House still do not get it. They do not yet realize, despite all of the scandals that are taking place that have brought down contempt on this institution, just how bad things have become because of their 38-year control of this institution.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who pulls this kind of a stunt and votes for this rule does not deserve to be called a Democrat by a big D or a small d.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues of both parties to step back for a minute, take a hard, objective look at this rule and do what is right. Do what is fair for the House and fair for the American people. Do what is right for the sake of fiscal sanity and responsibility around here. Let us at least give the House a chance to vote on these spending cuts, to vote individually on them, and to stand up and be counted.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to defeat the previous question so that we can make in order an amendment by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL], the cochairman of the "pork busters" task force, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], a Democrat, the cochairman of the same task force. Their amendment was properly filed with the Rules Committee and was requested in testimony before us yesterday. That amendment would eliminate this king-of-the-hill subterfuge nonsense in which the Democrats control all of the kings and their pawns, the American people. This rule is unconscionable. It is irresponsible on the part of this body.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to make no mistake about it. The previous question vote is a clear

vote on whether Members want to at least give the House an opportunity to double the savings. Let me read this handout to Members. "Vote no on the previous question to allow an amendment to double the bill's savings and reduce the deficit." That is what Members are going to be voting on here in about 20 minutes. Put in those terms, my colleagues, as we face a \$400 billion deficit, I think the choice is absolutely clear. We have got to vote down the previous question, and Members have to give this House a chance to work its will.

We are all good people. We have to stand up and be counted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume so that I might address a question to the gentleman from New York. I do not know the answer because I was not a part of the meeting. But it was my understanding, at least it was told to me that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] as a part of the leadership meeting from his party and our party, was given the opportunity to have a motion to recommit with instructions, and he turned that down. I have heard that, and I was just wondering if that was correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will yield, absolutely not. I am a part of the leadership committee, and nothing of what you have mentioned was offered to us.

Mr. DERRICK. In the negotiating sessions between both parties? I am glad for the answer and thank the gentleman for answering the question.

Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard about the Magnificent Seven. Now we hear about the Marauding Six.

I am going to support the rule, and I am going to support the Democrat version of the cuts for the following reason, and I am going to talk about conscience: President Bush would cut Pentagon procurement \$3.8 billion. President Bush would cut the Seawolf submarines \$2.7 billion. He would also cut R&D \$7.5 million, military construction \$136 million.

□ 1140

President Bush would not stop there. He would cut domestic programs \$721 million including \$596 million for housing, \$24 million for the National Park Service, \$25 million from health services; he would cut NASA, he would cut EPA.

Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States is prepared to cut everything from toilet paper to submarines in America, but there is not one penny of cuts in foreign aid. There is not one dime in the President's cuts

for international economic assistance or international military financing or international education and training. All of the cuts are for America.

Let me say this to the Members of Congress: If you do not stand here today with the Democrat version, then you should either retire or be defeated, because the country does not need those Members. Let me tell you, there is no wonder why there are fires in Los Angeles. Every city in America is going to be on fire, because people are getting tired of seeing the money go overseas and then cutting the opportunities for the American people and the American worker.

Let me say this: There can be no life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness without a damn job, and this is another example of it, folks. Whack out America, but do not touch those sacred cows overseas. I think that says it all.

I appreciate the time.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying appropriations rescission measure, H.R. 4990. This bill rescinds—cancels—over \$5.8 billion in previously appropriated fiscal year 1992 spending. This is nearly \$142 million more than recommended by the President. Of the amount rescinded by the bill, \$4.95 billion is from military spending accounts, \$123.8 million is from international affairs accounts, and \$734 million is from domestic discretionary programs.

I commend the Appropriations Committee for their product, which is a solid step toward reducing the Federal budget deficit. Some of us would have preferred a larger rescission package and were prepared to offer amendments to H.R. 4990 to cancel additional fiscal year 1992 appropriations, but those amendments were not made in order. While I am disappointed that the Rules Committee would not grant an open rule allowing my amendments to be offered, we clearly are casting today one of the most important deficit reduction votes of the year.

The rule does allow a vote on the President's March 10, March 20, and April 8 rescission proposals. It is only fair that the President be allowed a floor vote on these measures.

For the last 2 fiscal years, Congressman HARRIS FAWELL and I have spent countless days pouring over appropriations bills, attempting to identify and then disclose wasteful spending projects. The product of that work has been 2 pork busters bills. This year's pork busters' effort, H.R. 4315, would rescind spending for 640 projects totaling over \$1.5 billion. Many of those projects, colleagues, were in both President Bush's rescission messages and the reported committee bill cur-

rently before the House. And I certainly have every expectation that additional rescissions will be presented to the House in the coming weeks for floor votes. I have been assured by the leadership that on one of the next rescission bills we will have an opportunity to offer, as an amendment, our pork buster proposals. The President, for his part, has indicated he will continue to send rescissions to the Congress, and the Appropriations Committee, to their credit, will consider those and present their recommendations to the House. While some would prefer a different process, I favor any process that results in the elimination of unnecessary and wasteful Federal spending.

And let's not kid ourselves, our deficit problem is only getting worse. The 1992 deficit is estimated to exceed \$416 billion; the national debt will top \$4.080 trillion next year.

What does that kind of debt mean? A \$4 trillion-plus debt means that every American owes some financier somewhere in the world \$16,063, and just the interest on the 1992 deficit will add an additional \$1,159 to the per-capita debt burden of every American. This level of debt means a smaller pool of potential wealth for future generations, and it means, simply, that our children and grandchildren will not enjoy the same standard of living we do today.

Fundamentally, the deficit is a moral question. It is my view that we should use the opportunity provided by H.R. 4990—and any other that may come along in the next few months—to reduce the Nation's dependence on borrowed money.

I again commend the Appropriations Committee for their good work and urge support for H.R. 4990.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard from one of the cochairs of the pork busters task force.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL], the other member of this committee who has done yeoman work on trying to get spending under control in this House.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very much disappointed with this rule because, after months of bipartisan work by the pork busters group, every additional cut which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] just referred to in that spending which the pork busters, in working with the administration, had tried to add to the appropriation rescission package was just summarily turned down by the Committee on Rules.

Our key amendment which we had worked on for so very long would add \$6.6 billion for consideration on the floor of this House. Nobody can guarantee what the House might do, but we just asked for the consideration of the \$6.6 billion in spending cuts to be added to the \$5.8 billion in spending cuts by

the Committee on Appropriations in what I felt was a good-faith effort by the Committee on Appropriations. That would be \$12.4 billion in reduced low-priority spending.

Those additional cuts represent the balance of \$5.3 billion in Presidential spending rescissions for March 10 and March 20 and April 9 that we presented to the Committee on Rules which were not included in the appropriation bill rescissions, and we included \$1.3 billion in spending rescissions contained in the pork busters rescission bill of 1992—H.R. 4315. These additional spending cuts would have made the total spending rescissions to be considered today, as I have indicated, \$12.4 billion in what is being presented to us in H.R. 4990, rather than the \$5.8 billion of rescissions contained in that bill.

But the House is denied the right to even consider adding such spending cuts, and I do not understand that. We should be working toward bipartisanship, working together on this tremendously important question of debt and deficit.

The rule violates, too, the Budget Act of 1974 by killing the President's line-item-rescission right, and every Member's right in this body to rise and sponsor and cosponsor these rescission bills and to offer a privileged motion with only one-fifth of the Members voting for it. That is all killed and obliterated.

The President's part that he has to play, statutorily guaranteed to him, is just done away with. Once again, Congress says, "We do not have to abide by the laws we pass. We can just ignore them anytime that we want to."

Thus, you know, we are going to be voting today on whether or not we want \$120,000 for studying the disposal of animal manure, \$200,000 for Vidalia onion research. I could go on and on and on.

I support the Committee on Appropriations bill, as I said, as a first step toward cutting spending, but it seems to me the Committee on Rules does not want to support anything other than what the appropriators have passed upon.

And this is so important: This should not be an either/or choice between \$7.9 billion in Presidential rescissions and \$5.8 billion in Committee on Appropriations rescissions.

The pork busters did not ask for this kind of a choice. The membership of this House did not ask for this kind of a choice, nor did the administration ask for this choice.

□ 1150

The pork busters' view is that they do not in fact basically object to what the Appropriations Committee has suggested and given to them, nor do the taxpayers of this country ask for that kind of a "Sophie's choice". They do not want partisan wrangling. They

want bipartisan agreement on cutting as much unnecessary spending as is possible, and that is precisely what we sought in offering our bipartisan package of \$12.4 billion in cuts to be considered.

No, only the leadership of the majority and its official arm, the Rules Committee, and not many of them were there to listen to our story which was blanked out from TV coverage, dictated this slick "Sophie's choice" of the twin rescissions of the President and of the House Appropriations Committee.

Take your pick, the majority's choice of \$5.8 billion in rescissions, or slightly less than that were the President's March 10, March 20 and April 8 rescissions, and only those, because if you added more, the President's rescissions would have been greater than the Appropriations Committee rescissions, and heavens, we do not want that. You have to take one or the other; but of course, you cannot take both.

I mean, this is like a mother having to decide which twin she has to give up.

We ought to be working together. We ought to be complementing each other for this kind of rescission.

In addition, under this rule, with a king of the Hill arrangement, a Member can get credit for voting for both of these twin rescissions presented by the President and the Appropriations Committee, secure in the knowledge that the "Sophie's choice" provision combined with a "king of the Hill" provision will kill the President's spending cuts. The President does not have any chance whatsoever. I think that kind of Machiavellian talents which the Rules Committee is exhibiting is not wise.

Whatever the Rules Committee is, it certainly does not lack Machiavellian talents, when anyone outside the Appropriations Committee messes around with spending cuts. That is only for the Appropriations Committee.

Make no mistake about it. Anyone who votes for this rule is voting against the House having a chance—a chance to add \$6.6 billion of spending cuts to what the Appropriations Committee has suggested. It is that simple. We do not even have a motion to recommit, for instance, where we could take these three amendments and we could have that as the question being submitted to the committee. We cannot even do that.

The tax groups in this country are looking at this vote on this rule. It is the only significant vote we have before us today in regard to these rescission packages.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman who spoke before me, in

the sense that I think this is the most important vote we will take today. I am very pleased to support this rule, because I think it has been fashioned in a way that makes very clear the stark contrast in the way we go about handling rescissions.

There really is an untold story in this area. Many people focus all their attention in terms of cutting spending in the Federal sector on the discretionary appropriations, usually domestic appropriations, which are handled by the Appropriations Committee. I think we all know that to do this is to not look in the right places.

When I came to Congress 14 years ago, 28 percent of our budget was consumed with those annual discretionary appropriations. Today it is 14 percent.

Domestic appropriations have not been contributing to the problems of deficit spending and the additional burgeoning debt of this country. In fact, it is the only area of the budget that has been held in check. Part of the reason for that is that the response to the rescission package which you see here today is consistent with those that have been rendered to those submitted to us since the impoundment of President Nixon was countermanded by the enactment of the Budget Procedures Act back in 1974.

Since 1981, when President Reagan was elected, and we more clearly focused on this area of debate between the executive and the legislative branch, Congress has rescinded \$54.7 billion, more than the amounts requested by Presidents Reagan and Bush.

This year we have in this first of probably three rescission packages exceeded the request of the administration by \$142 million according to the GAO.

I say we will be back to this floor another time or two, because additional rescission messages have been or will be sent up.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] alluded to the fact that his group, the so-called pork busters group, will have a number of proposals made to the committee and we will consider them in the context of marking up the next and probably still the third round of budget reductions through the rescission process, and that is as it should be; but the Congress should set priorities in spending as long as it is responsible enough to deal with the general need that we can agree with the executive about, and that is to reduce spending wherever we can find waste, wherever we can find unworthy projects.

You know, the Congress has been typified as the big spenders, the root of all fiscal evil. The fact is very, very different. Since 1945, the end of the Second World War, during the entire cold war period, Congress actually ap-

propriated \$188 billion less than what was requested by the 10 Presidents who served during that period. We did not exceed the Executive's requests. We were short of them.

During the last 12 years, we come in below the requests of Presidents Reagan and Bush.

The Congress has done its job and it continues to do it here today. I hope we will adopt the rule and pass this rescission and prepare to study further to find additional savings that we will be required to make before the end of this session.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman in the well who just spoke, and I have great respect for him, let me just read what a nonpartisan group thinks about what Congress has done with these rescissions. This is what the Citizens for a Sound Economy, a very respected think tank, says:

Over the recent past, the record of Congress' fiscal responsibility has continued to sag. In the last five years Congress has approved only 0.01 percent of all rescissions submitted, which represents about a half inch gain on a hundred yard football field.

Now, you can say what you want, I can say what I want. This is a nonpartisan group speaking the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule.

The American people are sick and tired of politics as usual in Washington. At every town meeting I have held, and I have held a number of them lately, people ask me, "When will Congress get serious about cutting unnecessary Government spending?"

I ask you the same question. When will this body get serious about cutting unnecessary Government spending?

Congress has sown the seeds for economic disaster in this country by spending over \$3 trillion it does not have. As a result, we are paying nearly \$300 billion on interest on the debt alone, destroying American jobs and destroying American competitiveness.

Peter Grace, the very respected chairman of the Grace Commission and founder of Citizens Against Government Waste, predicts that by the year 2000, Federal interest payments alone will consume all Federal income tax revenues. In other words, our children and our grandchildren will be paying off tomorrow what Congress spends today.

So I ask you, when will Congress get serious about cutting unnecessary Government spending? How many more jobs must be lost before Congress passes a balanced budget amendment? How many dollars need to be squandered before Congress gives the President the line-item veto? How much longer must the American people wait

before Congress gets serious about cutting Government waste?

As Senator RUDMAN said recently, "We don't have much time left."

The clock is ticking. It is time Congress cuts the pork. It is time Congress listens to the pork busters and at least considers the \$12.2 billion in proposed rescissions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to vote for fiscal responsibility. Vote against this rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, today I am going to quietly oppose this rule. I say quietly because I commend the Appropriations Committee for the job that they have done on this rule, but all of us know we have not gone far enough.

I, too, appeared before the Rules Committee and would have liked very much to have seen the modified rescission order process considered on the floor today. I am disappointed that it is not.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that this House should and will consider in the regular legislative process this procedure.

Just as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] spoke a moment ago, we all know that we are going to be back on this floor within a few weeks with some other additional very tough decisions.

□ 1200

The pork busters have got a good idea. I commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] for the ideas and hard work they have put in to send a message to this body and through this body to the people that business as usual is not going to be tolerated.

You know, I get a little impatient sometimes with the criticisms that those of us who support the balanced-budget amendment are receiving from certain quarters, and I will quote the Washington Post that criticizes this as a gimmick. It is not a gimmick, it is not a gimmick. It is interesting that the same Washington Post, when we had the firewalls vote in here, which was a first step toward meaningful, tough decisions, they editorialized against that too.

You know, we have got some other tough decisions. I take this time on this rule, hopefully, to gain the support of a majority of my colleagues on both sides of the House when we consider committee funding; please do not bring a rule to this House that calls for an increase in funding for this branch of the Government because if you do, I will not quietly oppose it, and I believe the overwhelming majority of the Members of this body will not quietly

oppose it. And when we begin to look at the budget conference that we are going into today, and the conferees were appointed, please let us understand, colleagues, that in this body this budget that we passed we call for a 5-percent cut from freeze in the legislative and executive branches of Government. The Senate called for a 25-percent cut. In the spirit of compromise, somewhere in between would be a good, solid, loud statement for this body to make to the American people that we are serious and that we are about to make some of those tough decisions.

So, today I quietly will vote against this rule, but I am saying this, I believe, on behalf of a large number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, that we understand business as usual is over. We have a \$4 trillion debt, \$400 billion this year, \$352 billion next year. The balanced-budget amendment, constitutional amendment is a serious effort, and I hope that we will start today by passing this rescission and immediately set in stage those other necessary rescissions, including those day-to-day rescissions, like legislative funding, like the budget conference, and some of the other tough decisions that we are going to have to make to show that we truly are serious.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] has 14½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER].

Mr. CARPER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am unable to vote for this rule today. And as Mr. STENHOLM, I will quietly oppose it.

I am pleased that we will have the opportunity to vote on the rescissions presented to us by the appropriations bill, rather the Appropriations Committee. I think for the most part they have done a very good job.

I am pleased we will have the opportunity to vote up or down on the rescissions proposed by the administration as well. I think that is how the process should work. I think when the President offers a rescission, a package of rescissions, we should have to vote on them.

In the last Congress, a number of us, Representative JOHNSON of South Dakota, Representative PATTERSON of South Carolina, the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. GLICKMAN, several of our Republican colleagues, Mr. ARMEY and Mrs. Martin, worked together to try to craft some change in the way that we approach the matter of rescissions. We

had hoped to offer today an amendment that would incorporate somewhat, I think, our modest but, I think good, changes to the rescission process.

Here is basically how we think the process should work: We would like to take a 2-year test drive, something like enhanced or expedited rescission power, some call it statutory line item veto power. But it is just for 2 years. In the 103d Congress, 1993 and 1994, when the President signs an appropriation bill, he would send or could send a message to the Congress outlining the rescissions he would like to make, the cuts in that appropriation bill, to be introduced as legislation here, to affirm or approve those rescissions. We in the House of Representatives would have 10 days to vote on it, 10 days of continuous session to actually vote on that measure. We could vote it down, we could vote it down with a simple majority vote. But we would have to vote on it.

If you pass it and it goes to the Senate, then they would have, again, roughly 10 days to consider it. If they vote it down—they could vote it down, but they would have to consider it.

We tried to target in our proposal the major thrust of rescissions on unauthorized programs. To the extent that the President wants to rescind funding for programs that are not authorized, he would not be restricted. He could rescind up to 100 percent of funding for unauthorized programs.

To the extent that programs are fully authorized, the President could take the funding down to the freeze level that prevailed for the previous year. For newly authorized programs the President, under our proposal, could rescind up to 25 percent of the appropriated amount.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to commend the gentleman for the work that he is doing because I think it is efforts such as he is pioneering in regard to enhanced Presidential rescission power that will enable us all to get the job done, and we all so very much want to make some types of gains in regard to the tremendous debt and deficit.

So I simply want to commend the gentleman for his ideas and the concepts that he is espousing.

Mr. CARPER. I thank the gentleman. I regret we were unable to vote on the amendment Mr. PENNY was prepared to offer today. But it is my hope and expectation that we will have a chance to revisit that when we do address the issue of rescissions down the line.

Let me just close by saying one of my complaints or discomforts with today's vote is we are lumping together

Seawolf submarines with section 8 housing. I would much prefer for us to be able to go appropriation bill by appropriation bill, and that would be part of our proposed changes.

My hope is that the next rescission that does come to the floor, that we will have the opportunity to consider as well the sorts of reforms we are working on on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume before I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. Let me point out to the gentleman for whom I have great respect, the gentleman from Delaware, that if we defeat the previous question we will have the opportunity to vote individually on each one of these appropriation matters. That is the way the House ought to work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I certainly rise in support of the idea of defeating the previous question. Also, if that is not done and the rule is not amended, we should defeat the rule, because, Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase the poet, "Oh, what tangled web we weave when our objective is to deceive." That is what this rule is really all about.

This rule is about deceiving the American public into believing that we are doing something serious about cutting spending. That is why the Committee on Rules could not debate this issue in front of the TV cameras. The deception would have become all too apparent to the American people if they had actually had to go before the TV cameras and show the American people exactly what was going on and tell the American people what was exactly going on.

Now, the fact is that at least there are some Democrats who are willing to quietly recognize that the deception is contained in this rule. They know that the rule is designed to deceive the public. They know that the rule is designed to evade the law. They know that there is no credible defense for what this rule proposes to do.

I only wish that, instead of being quiet about it, they would shout from the rooftops about it because the fact is that we are going to need a coalition of people who are willing to stand up and be counted if we are going to get the budget deficits under control.

The Committee on Rules is not going to cooperate with anything that really cuts spending. They are showing us this time after time. The Rules Committee is in the control of the leadership of this House, and they are going to try to continue to spend every dime they can get their hands on. And when they cannot get their hands on any more money, they are willing to spend

deficit money and they are willing to spend \$400 billion in deficits, they are willing to add to the \$3 trillion debt. They are willing to have it go to a \$4 trillion debt. And they are showing us that they are willing to do that in this rule today.

We ought to be mad, we ought to be shouting from the rooftops. We ought to be saying that this rule is unacceptable. We ought to be saying this rule should be turned down flatly. We ought to get on with the business of really cutting spending. Cut the spending the Appropriations Committee wants to cut, and then add the President's cuts to it.

The fact is what this rule does is denies us the opportunity to do that. We ought to get serious about cutting spending. We ought not go through these games of deception. I am sick and tired of rules coming to this floor that are simply designed to evade the rules, evade the law and to ultimately keep the American people from seeing real spending cuts.

Let us get mad, let us vote down this rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. And I want to thank the Committee on Appropriations for their hard work on these rescissions whereby the House is going to be voting on \$142 million more rescissions than what President Bush submitted. So the Congress has different priorities clearly than what President Bush submitted, but that is part of the give and take of our democratic process.

I think we can hold our heads high. In fact, in cutting the budget \$142 million more than was requested by President Bush and in fact I think over a period of time since 1974 Congress has rescinded around \$2 billion more than has been requested by Presidents over that period of time. So I think those are the figures. But I do want to go on, if I may finish my statement and if I have time remaining, I will certainly yield to the gentleman.

But I think what we are in need of, however, is modifications in institutional mechanisms for dealing with rescissions. That is one of my key concerns and why I come to the floor today.

I have joined with the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER], the gentlewoman from South Carolina [Mrs. PATTERSON] and others in promoting an enhanced line item rescission idea.

□ 1210

Mr. Speaker, I oppose a line item veto. A two-thirds majority to override would simply grant enormous priority-making power to the executive branch,

would allow the executive to virtually extort votes from Members of the House. But, on the other hand, I think that there is unjustified spending that goes on in the House, and we need a mechanism that allows more accountability, that automatically requires a vote from Members of Congress, and that is what our rescission legislation would do. It does not shift the balance of power between legislative and executive, does not change the balance that the founders of this Republic envisioned, but yet, at the same time, would require every Member of Congress to go home and say, "Yes, I voted for this," or, "I voted against this." They cannot go home with the excuse, "Well, this legislation, this spending, was in a larger bill that had to pass."

Mr. Speaker, this would require more accountability, and I think that that is a fair and reasonable reform. I think it is something to get at individual spending items.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, in yielding 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], I will say to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] that we offered his and the gentleman from Delaware's [Mr. CARPER] amendment in the Rules Committee. It lost by a party line vote of 6 to 4. I wish it could have been on the floor, it was a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to the rule and to urge my colleagues to vote against it.

I support the proposed cuts in the Appropriations Committee's bill, H.R. 4990. This bill singles out prime cuts of pork. My colleagues who are members of the bipartisan coalition "congressional pork busters," announced their support of this bill. The administration also indicated support for this bill.

As you know, the rule governs the way this House considers legislation. It was our intent to cut pork from the Federal budget. I believe this is not only an admirable intention, it is a necessary one: We face a \$400 billion dollar deficit this year. However, this rule skews this admirable intention and stifles free and open debate in this House. The Rules Committee has denied us any amendments.

Instead, this rule forces us to consider the President's \$5.4 billion rescission package as a substitute. By making these rescissions a substitute to the bill, the rule ensures defeat of the amendment and defeat of the additional savings in the budget. It also denies the porkbusters the opportunity to bring their \$1.3 billion in savings before the House for a vote.

The rule denies our intention to add our cuts to those cuts in H.R. 4990. And who ultimately loses when we are de-

nied the chance to cut pork from the budget? The American people.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from South Carolina [Mrs. PATTERSON].

Mrs. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] yielding this time to me.

I would like to thank the leadership for allowing us the vote on rescission today. I think it is an important vote. But I regret that our amendment for the enhanced rescission of line item veto authority was not given, and, for that reason, I will vote against the rule.

Let me just say to the Members of Congress and to those people who might be listening today: Since coming to Congress I have done all that I can to deal with the deficit. I have taken some tough votes to restrain spending to deal with that deficit. I've also had a bill introduced into each Congress since I've been here to reform the process. One of the sections of that bill calls for the enhanced line item veto rescission. I think it's something we must do, and do quickly, or this deficit is going to continue to grow. I won't have the opportunity today because my amendment, and the amendment of the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER], the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], is not a part of this rule. But believe me. I will be back on this floor with that bill every opportunity I get because I think it's an important process that we must deal with as we deal with budget reform.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the renowned pork buster, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding this time to me.

I ask my colleagues, "Do you ever wonder why the American people think we're unethical and slick politicians around here?" Well, today we have a perfect example. The President sent us a list of \$5.7 billion in pork barrel spending cuts and asked us to vote on them. The people on the Committee on Appropriations did not want these cuts, so they came up with cuts of their own. Well, that is OK. The more, the better, because spending is out of control.

However, Mr. Speaker, they will not allow the President's cuts to have a chance. Now how do they do this? They use a ruse procedure called king of the Hill, which means simply that the big spenders can vote. They can vote in favor of the President's cuts so they look good back home. But then, right

after that, they vote on another spending cut bill or amendment which rescinds the previous vote. They know full well when they vote for the \$5.7 billion in spending cuts that the President proposes that it will be overridden by their next vote. So, they can vote for both of them, and go home and say, "I voted for all this pork busting," when in fact they know darn well they did not vote for the \$5.7 billion the President just sent up here.

Is it any wonder the American people do not trust us because we use procedures like this, because we use ruses like this? We have a \$400 billion deficit staring us in the face this year, a \$4 trillion national debt, \$350 billion in interest, and we continue to do this kind of gamesmanship up here.

This has got to end. We have to set priorities on spending. If we do not, our kids are going to have a terrible future, and it is going to be our fault.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, obviously, in support of the rule. The rule provides a procedure whereby we can in fact respond to the suggestions of the President as the legislative process was meant to work, and that is to say that we consider his proposals. In fact, in this instance we adopt a large number of his proposals. The legislature, through the Committee on Appropriations, then added to that and, in fact, exceeded the President's request. The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], one of the chairmen of the Subcommittees on Appropriations, has put together from the GAO report an excellent analysis of our response to requests for rescissions where in fact over the years, since 1974, the Congress of the United States, acting responsibly and in its effort to keep contained Government spending, has rescinded more collectively than the Presidents have asked and in fact, of course, has rescinded more than President Bush and President Reagan have asked for.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania talked about the light of day. My colleagues know full well that this is nibbling at the margins at best, at very best. What is the problem as it relates to deficits annually and the national debt? The problem is that the President has not led. The President has submitted fiscal programs to this Congress, and we put them on the floor, my colleagues, in 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988 and this year. And on the President's side of the aisle, he got, in 1985, one vote for his plan for overall spending in America, fiscal priorities. We did not do it in 1986. In 1987 he got 12 votes from his side of the aisle; in 1988, 27; and this

year, approximately one-fourth of the Members of his party.

This is nibbling at the margins. The fact of the matter is the President is elected to lead this country and has not placed before the Congress of the United States a viable budgetary program, fiscal policies that his own party would support.

Now those are the figures. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] can rise and be outraged, but he cannot deny the numbers of his own party who supported the President's fiscal program.

Now I happen to believe that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK], and others are making positive contributions, and we are going to address those, and we ought to address those because this national debt and annual operating deficit will destroy our country and economy if we do not. But it is not on this bill or on these marginal, minuscule proposals that have been postured on as being meaningful.

□ 1220

The fiscal program and the lack of leadership has been why we are where we are today, and the numbers clearly reflect that every time the President's budget has been on this floor for support or lack of support by his own party.

In fact, of course, President Bush's first budget, the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, after having said he was going to offer it, refused to offer it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, in all my years on this floor, I have never heard a more inaccurate statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I simply wanted to point out an error in two of the speeches that were made on the other side of the aisle; inadvertently, I am sure.

They said that the Presidential rescissions were less than the rescissions of the appropriating committee. That is just not true.

The President has submitted \$7.9 billion worth of rescissions, but what the Committee on Rules does is to chop off the \$2.2 billion of rescissions of April 9. They took the April 8 one, put a magic line, because, of course, they did not want anyone to say that the President is rescinding more than the Committee on Appropriations.

I just wanted to make that very, very clear.

I also want to make it clear that in regard to the initiating rescissions by

the Congress, that since 1974, the President has requested \$63 billion worth of rescissions. Congress has responded with \$19 billion. An awful lot of what they responded with was rescissions of spending that would not take place anyway. They continued to protect their pork, you see.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, responding briefly to the remarks of my colleague from California, who has made the case that Congress has year after year behaved responsibly, we are going to have a \$400 billion deficit this year. That is not responsible. Ignorance is not truth; war is not peace, and Congress has not been behaving responsibly.

I urge a "no" vote on this coverup rule. I urge it, among other things, in my capacity as cochairman of the congressional Grace caucus. I have just received a letter from the president of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, and they are going to make this vote on the coverup rule a key vote in their ratings.

I call this the coverup rule because its purpose is to prevent separate votes on the individual rescission proposals made by the President, despite the clear requirement of the law. This rule is going to lump all of the President's proposed cuts together, subtract some, put in others the Congress wants and generally obfuscate.

In other words, the purpose of the coverup rule is to permit Congress to perpetuate its gross, flaccid, and wasteful deficit spending. It is to permit Congress to protect the privileges and prerogatives of the ruling class that has spent so much of our tax money in secret and without votes, and it is going to allow the Congress to hide the dirty secrets of this fraternity of ill-repute, this animal house of runaway overdrafted checkbooks.

It is going to permit the Washington, DC, bureaucracy and, yes, this Congress to continue to grow fat while American's savings, investment in jobs continue to grow lean.

I said the law requires separate votes. The law we are talking about is title II of the United States Code, section 688. The rule permits one-fifth of the Members to demand individual votes. Section 2 of this rule purports to waive the law. That law governs the rights not only of this Congress but of the President.

It will not work. It is illegal. Congress is breaking the law. Let us not take this institution further into disrepute.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the words of the gentleman be taken down earlier. Could we review the gentleman's words earlier.

He seemed to cast some disparity among this House that is absolutely out of context and out of order. Would the gentleman's words be taken down? I would like to review the words. I did not hear them all.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand regular order. I think this is in line, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Chair rules that the demand is too late and the gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition because the rule turns this debate from how much and where to cut to who is going to get the credit. And it misses the opportunity for us to save \$7 billion of identified waste.

Mr. Speaker, when I heard reports yesterday that the Rules Committee majority prohibited C-SPAN cameras from showing the American people the committee's deliberations, I was puzzled as to why, without warning, the Rules Committee was changing the rules. After seeing what the Rules Committee reported on this bill yesterday, I now know why they were so eager to keep the American people from seeing their work.

If you were still unsure about why the American people have so little faith in this House and believe that Congress is more interested in political gamesmanship than in economic common sense, just look at this rule. It's textbook congressional maneuvering, heavy-handed and bilingually partisan, and the American people will again be the losers.

The Rules Committee was presented with four amendments by the bipartisan pork busters group of which I am a member. Three of the amendments proposed additional rescissions—spending cuts over and above what the Appropriations Committee suggested, and the fourth enhanced the rescission process to pave the way for additional spending cuts. Please don't misunderstand—I do commend the Appropriations Committee on its rescission package, but I have to ask "Why stop there?" The cuts proposed by the President and the pork busters group were serious attempts to further reduce unnecessary Federal spending. However, the rules makes none of these amendments in order.

If these amendments had been allowed, Congress could be voting today on a total rescission package of over \$12 billion—not enough to drastically reduce the budget deficit, but certainly a bigger step in that direction than the program we actually have on the floor. Only those rescissions offered by the Appropriations Committee are permitted under today's rule, with the President's rescissions relegated to substitute status. Mr. Chairman, cutting spending shouldn't be an either/or proposition. If the projects aren't necessary, they should be cut. Only in Washington does it seem to matter whether cutting vidalian onion storage or prickly pear research is the President's idea or one that originated with the Congress.

It appears that the majority has been successful in turning this debate away from how much and where to cut to who will get credit for the cuts. It doesn't matter to the American people where the cuts originate. They see a \$400 billion deficit and rightfully demand action. What they are getting instead is more po-

litical bologna and yet another example of a Congress more interested in image than substance.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote down this rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I simply wanted to respond to some of the responses that we heard from the other side. We have had waved around reports of various so-called bipartisan organizations that portend more information than the General Accounting Office has.

The GAO says that since 1974, when this particular Budget Act was enacted into law, we have evidence that shows that Congress has rescinded \$63 billion, which is \$1.6 billion more than the various Presidents have proposed. There is no question about that. It is on the record.

We do not include those that have been submitted this year, which are being acted on as we speak and will be acted on during the next few weeks.

After all, the President has sent several messages to Congress, and we will have to deal with all of them in time. This is only the first of several.

It is fair to say that in this bill we have actually \$142 million more than the President has proposed in his March 10, 20, and April 8 rescission messages. So we are doing the job we have been asked to do, despite all the attempts to obfuscate.

There is no questions about it, and the GAO has confirmed it, not some organization that has no basis in fact, that has a partisan agenda to implement.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman is a man of good will, and the only point I wanted to bring out, and I think I heard the gentleman correctly, is that no one disputes the fact that Congress goes ahead and initiates a lot of rescissions on their own. Many times it is part of the appropriations process.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is hardly noticed. It is hardly debated on this floor.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, what we are pointing out here is that when the President tries to play his part, most, a high, high percentage of what he requests, is simply killed, ignored. And the Congress goes ahead and makes what rescissions they want to make.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we have not ignored it. We have not always agreed to it. That is the traditional tension between both branches of Government. We set spending priorities and they

rarely deviate in any fundamental way from the executive branch, only in the detail.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to attest and put my name with the comments of the gentleman from California [Mr. COX]. He said it exactly like it is.

This rule is an attempt to deceive the American people.

My friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] said that we would like to look at unworthy spending projects, and we agreed. But if we block the good and the bad in one, it is an attempt to hide and deceive.

Democrats will go home and say, "I tried to cut spending," when they know it is total deception.

We spent 8 hours the other day looking at whether we are going to separate our bank accounts and make them visible. We can spend 8 hours on individual cutting.

My friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] talked about how we blocked foreign aid, and there is no cuts in foreign aid. That is wrong also, because we blocked those countries of giving aid, that does the United States benefit, and lump them in with the ones that are bad and that are political votes. That is also wrong, just like this rule.

We need to support and vote for individual items. Do not deceive the American public.

□ 1230

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ALLEN], someone we are going to miss very much.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule, and if the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is sincere in realizing we need reform, this whole debate here on this rule is an example of why we need a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget and to clearly give to the President the power that 43 Governors have, which is the line-item veto.

I have introduced a measure, House Resolution 447, which would clearly do that. I would ask the gentleman from Maryland to sign on as a cosponsor.

The vote on this rule is clearly a vote to waste an additional \$5 billion on projects such as disposal of animal manure studies. I like Vidalia onions, but the producers of those can pay for the study of storage. We do not need research on prickly pear cactus. We do not need to spend \$1½ million for a theater in New York City. These and many projects which were part of the President's rescission proposal are not in the committee bill. We are avoiding a straight up or down vote.

I would hope we would oppose this House rule, require a balanced budget

and a line-item veto, so we will avoid these sorts of charades being perpetrated on the American taxpayers in the future.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] only has one closing speaker, then I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, to close out our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from California is recognized for up 2 minutes.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Democratic caucus, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], he referred to the fact that this was nickeling at the margin, and I could not help but bring to mind that famous old line from the Senator from Illinois, Everett Dirksen, who said, "\$1 billion here, \$1 billion there, and before long you are talking about real money." So I think we should take the bold step that is necessary here.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am thoroughly confused, as I am sure the American people are, Mr. Speaker. A question: Is it not true that for the past 38 years under the Democrat-controlled Congress that we had mandated spending programs which give the President no alternative but to ask for that money?

How do we propose to go about ever balancing the budget when the people that are screaming the loudest for the balancing of the budget, they want to balance the budget, from the President, but they never vote for budget decreases. They vote for more mandated spending, and then they criticize the President for not coming up with a balanced budget.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman makes a very good point. What we have done is, we have seen these kinds of programs imposed on the executive branch and then we criticize them for spending.

Let me say that we have another organization which is clearly bipartisan, not partisan, the National Taxpayers Union, which has criticized as many Members on this side of the aisle as they have on the other side of the aisle. This vote is going to be a test vote by the National Taxpayers Union.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that this is in fact a gag rule. It is a closed rule which is preventing us from having the opportunity to bring about the kinds of cuts which the President wants. If we had had C-SPAN upstairs in the Com-

mittee on Rules, the American people could see clearly what the majority is trying to do to us here. Tragically, they were shut out.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the previous question so we can allow an amendment to double the bill's savings and reduce the deficit.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make the point that the answer to the gentleman's question of what the President has to send down is no, the President is not mandated. The President can send down any budget proposal he determines to be appropriate, and notwithstanding the fact that for the last 12 years the Presidents have said they are for a balanced budget, they have not sent one.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure those on the floor, and certainly those watching this out in TV land must be thoroughly disgusted.

The rule that we have before us allows us to consider legislation that will save the American taxpayers almost \$6 billion.

There are obviously different ways to go about saving this money.

In fairness, the Committee on Rules has made the President's rescission proposal in order so everyone will have an opportunity to decide, whether Republican or Democrat, how we want to save this money. But the thing that must remain uppermost in our minds is that we are going to save almost \$6 billion of the American taxpayers' money. That is a tremendous achievement.

We can debate whether it was President Reagan's fault, President Bush's fault, or who else's fault it might have been. The fact of the matter is that we have a deficit in this country that is entirely too large. Although the President chose to blame the situation in Los Angeles on the policies of the Democratic administrations of the 1960's, I want to tell our brothers and sisters across the Hall that we are not going to blame the current recession on Herbert Hoover.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the weakening rule under which the House must consider important and needed cuts in Federal spending.

I represent taxpayers who do not want to spend their hard-earned money on manure disposal in Michigan or onion storage in Georgia. My constituents do not want to buy local parking garages in Kentucky or arts and crafts centers in Florida.

I believe, and my constituents believe, that their Federal taxes should be spent on projects that are good for all Americans. My constituents' taxes should not be spent for other people's pet projects.

This rule is designed to weaken our efforts to curb the deficit. This rule will protect over \$6.6 billion in pet work projects, including the ones I mentioned, from being added to the committee bill.

Clearly and simply, a vote for this rule is a vote for pork barrel spending at its worst.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this weakening rule and join me in fighting for stronger deficit reduction.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, the liberal Democrat majority in this House has hit rock bottom, and the American people need to know just how sad things have gotten here in Congress after nearly five decades of one-party domination.

Yes, in order to save programs of vital national interest such as: A \$120,000 study of the disposal of animal manure; \$200,000 for Vidalia onion storage; \$100,000 for mesquite and prickly pear research; \$2.5 million to expand an arts center in Florida; \$1 million to build a parking garage in Kentucky; the Democrat House leadership is willing to violate the 1974 Budget and Impoundment Act, and flagrantly abuse the rights of every House Member.

This rule is just another example of the disgraceful procedural gymnastics that the liberal Democrat leadership must undertake in order to achieve their intended results. The liberal Democrat leadership, founded on big government, high taxes, pork-barrel special projects, and the economic stagnation that they cause, wastes the taxpayer's money while passing the blame to everyone else.

Facing a budget deficit of nearly \$400 billion, the President exercised his rights under the 1974 Budget Act and asked Congress to approve \$5.7 billion in rescissions. In other words, he requested that \$5.7 billion be trimmed from the Federal deficit.

Section 1017 of the 1974 Budget Act, the law of the land, a law this House should live by, permits the President's rescission requests to be brought to the House floor under special procedures. This rule, in the sad tradition of the liberal Democrat leadership, waives that law. Once again, Congress exempts itself from the little fiscal discipline that Federal budget laws embody.

In the spirit of fiscal responsibility that was initiated by the President's rescission requests, the Appropriations Committee came up with a list of cuts of their own. As is their heritage, they found even more money to cut than the President. They have a bill that cuts \$5.8 billion—and I applaud that effort.

With a \$400 billion deficit, that's \$5.8 billion less that our children will be responsible for.

This should have been a great day for the House. If the House operated in a way that even approximated a fair democratic body, we would vote, up or down, on the appropriator's cuts. We would vote, up or down, to add the cuts that the President requested, but with which the appropriators did not agree. In the spirit of fiscal responsibility, we should even vote, up or down, on the additional cuts that the pork buster coalition has identified and requested.

But, of course, if we voted on each of those cuts, we might save more money than the liberal leadership would like. Therefore, using their absolute control over the Rules Committee, they crafted a rule to minimize the budget cuts.

They put together a rule that protects as many of these wasteful projects as possible, but will let the Democrat leadership come to

the floor and talk about how much they support fiscal responsibility. Their rule says we can make the President's cuts, or the committee's cuts, but never both. And by the way, don't even think about the pork busters cuts.

Those leadership words about fiscal responsibility, about cutting more than the President, ring hollow in the face of reality.

Today's charade is a classic example of why this House, run by the Democrats for five decades, does not work. This rule, like nearly every rule that comes out of the Rules Committee these days, is crafted to maximize political benefits for the Democrat leadership, and minimize benefits for our Nation.

The liberal leadership has their majority lined up to protect onion and manure research. They have some cuts to offer, because the President pushed them into a corner, and forced them to offer some cuts—but nothing more than the minimum.

Defeating this rule is the only vote that matters today. Defeating the rule will permit the House to vote on more program cuts. Some additional cuts may pass, some may fail, but for once this House would do its job, rather than pass on its responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I only hope that the press and the American people see this exercise for what it really is, another effort by the liberal House leadership to avoid fiscal responsibility, save special pork projects, abuse House rules, and the law of the land, to confuse the issues enough to avoid responsibility for their actions. Vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 257, nays 160, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—257

Abercrombie	Blackwell	Collins (MI)
Ackerman	Bonior	Condit
Alexander	Borski	Conyers
Anderson	Boucher	Cooper
Andrews (ME)	Brewster	Costello
Andrews (NJ)	Browder	Cox (IL)
Andrews (TX)	Brown	Coyne
Annuzio	Bruce	Cramer
Anthony	Bryant	Darden
Applegate	Bustamante	de la Garza
Aspin	Campbell (CO)	DeFazio
Atkins	Cardin	DeLauro
Bacchus	Carper	Dellums
Barnard	Carr	Derrick
Beilenson	Chapman	Dicks
Bennett	Clay	Dingell
Berman	Clement	Dixon
Bevill	Coleman (TX)	Donnelly
Bilbray	Collins (IL)	Dooley

Dorgan (ND)	Lantos	Ray
Downey	LaRocco	Reed
Durbin	Laughlin	Richardson
Dwyer	Lehman (CA)	Roe
Dymally	Levin (MI)	Roemer
Early	Lewis (GA)	Rose
Eckart	Lipinski	Rostenkowski
Edwards (CA)	Lloyd	Roybal
Edwards (TX)	Long	Russo
Engel	Lowe (NY)	Sabo
English	Luken	Sanders
Erdreich	Machtley	Sangmeister
Espy	Manton	Sarpalius
Evans	Markey	Savage
Fascell	Martinez	Sawyer
Fazio	Matsui	Scheuer
Felghan	Mavroules	Schroeder
Foglietta	Mazzoli	Schumer
Ford (MI)	McCloskey	Serrano
Ford (TN)	McCurdy	Sharp
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Sikorski
Franks (CT)	McHugh	Sisk
Frost	McMillen (MD)	Sisk
Gaydos	McNulty	Skaggs
Gelderson	Mfume	Skelton
Gephardt	Miller (CA)	Slatery
Geren	Mineta	Slaughter
Gibbons	Mink	Smith (FL)
Glickman	Mollohan	Smith (IA)
Gonzalez	Montgomery	Solarz
Gordon	Moody	Spratt
Guarini	Moran	Stallings
Hall (OH)	Mrazek	Stark
Hall (TX)	Murphy	Stenholm
Hamilton	Murtha	Stokes
Harris	Nagle	Studds
Hatcher	Natcher	Swett
Hayes (IL)	Neal (MA)	Swift
Hayes (LA)	Neal (NC)	Synar
Hefner	Nowak	Tallon
Hertel	Oakar	Tanner
Hoagland	Oberstar	Tauzin
Hochbrueckner	Obey	Taylor (MS)
Horn	Olin	Thomas (GA)
Hoyer	Oliver	Thornton
Hubbard	Ortiz	Torres
Huckaby	Orton	Torricelli
Hughes	Owens (NY)	Towns
Hutto	Owens (UT)	Trafficant
Jefferson	Pallone	Traxler
Jenkins	Panetta	Unsoeld
Johnson (CT)	Parker	Vento
Johnson (SD)	Patterson	Visclosky
Johnston	Payne (NJ)	Volkmer
Jones (GA)	Payne (VA)	Walsh
Jones (NC)	Pease	Washington
Jontz	Pelosi	Waxman
Kanjorski	Penny	Weiss
Kaptur	Perkins	Wheat
Kennedy	Peterson (FL)	Whitten
Kennelly	Peterson (MN)	Williams
Kildee	Pickett	Wilson
Klecicka	Pickle	Wise
Kopetski	Poshard	Wolpe
Kostmayer	Price	Wyden
LaFalce	Rahall	Yates
Lancaster	Rangel	

NAYS—160

Allard	Cox (CA)	Grandy
Allen	Crane	Green
Archer	Cunningham	Gunderson
Armey	Davis	Hammerschmidt
Baker	DeLay	Hancock
Ballenger	Dickinson	Hansen
Barrett	Doolittle	Hastert
Barton	Dornan (CA)	Hefley
Bateman	Dreier	Henry
Bentley	Duncan	Herger
Bereuter	Edwards (OK)	Hobson
Bilirakis	Emerson	Holloway
Bliley	Ewing	Hopkins
Boehert	Fawell	Horton
Boehner	Fields	Houghton
Broomfield	Fish	Hunter
Bunning	Galleghy	Hyde
Burton	Gallo	Inhofe
Callahan	Gekas	Ireland
Camp	Gilchrist	Jacobs
Chandler	Gillmor	James
Clinger	Gilman	Johnson (TX)
Coble	Gingrich	Kasich
Coleman (MO)	Goodling	Klug
Combest	Goss	Kolbe
Coughlin	Gradison	Kyl

Lagomarsino	Oxley	Shays
Leach	Packard	Shuster
Lent	Paxon	Skeen
Lewis (CA)	Petri	Smith (NJ)
Lewis (FL)	Porter	Smith (OR)
Lightfoot	Pursell	Smith (TX)
Livingston	Quillen	Snowe
Lowery (CA)	Ramstad	Solomon
Marlenee	Ravenel	Spence
Regula	Rhodes	Stearns
McCandless	Ridge	Stump
McCollum	Riggs	Sundquist
McCrery	Rinaldo	Taylor (NC)
McDade	Ritter	Thomas (CA)
McEwen	Roberts	Thomas (WY)
McGrath	Rogers	Upton
McMillan (NC)	Rohrabacher	Vander Jagt
Meyers	Ros-Lehtinen	Vucanovich
Michel	Roth	Walker
Miller (OH)	Roukema	Weldon
Miller (WA)	Santorum	Wolf
Molinar	Saxton	Wyllie
Moorhead	Schaefer	Young (AK)
Morella	Schiff	Young (FL)
Morrison	Schulze	Zeliff
Myers	Sensenbrenner	Zimmer
Nichols	Shaw	
Nussle		

NOT VOTING—17

AuCoin	Flake	Staggers
Boxer	Kolter	Valentine
Brooks	Lehman (FL)	Waters
Byron	Levine (CA)	Weber
Campbell (CA)	Moakley	Yatron
Dannemeyer	Pastor	

□ 1258

Mr. EWING changed his vote from "yea" to "nay".

Mr. HUTTO changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, is it true that if this rule, this upcoming vote, is defeated, that we are done with our work for the day and the week?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not now aware of the further schedule of the House for the day.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I could not hear what the Chair said.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not aware of the further schedule of the House for the day after this vote.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A record vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 178, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

AYES—240

Abercrombie Gibbons Oliver
Ackerman Glickman Ortiz
Alexander Gonzalez Owens (NY)
Anderson Gordon Owens (UT)
Andrews (ME) Green
Andrews (NJ) Guarini
Andrews (TX) Hall (OH)
Annunzio Hamilton
Anthony Hatcher
Applegate Hayes (IL)
Aspin Hayes (LA)
Bacchus Hefner
Beilenson Hertel
Bennett Hoagland
Berman Hochbrueckner
Bevill Horn
Bilbray Horton
Blackwell Hoyer
Bonior Hughes
Borski Jefferson
Boucher Jenkins
Brewster Johnson (CT)
Brooks Johnson (SD)
Browder Johnston
Brown Jones (GA)
Bruce Jones (NC)
Bryant Kanjorski
Bustamante Kaptur
Campbell (CO) Kennedy
Cardin Kennelly
Carr Kildee
Chapman Kleczka
Clay Kopetski
Clement Kostmayer
Coleman (TX) LaFalce
Collins (IL) Lancaster
Collins (MI) Lantoso
Conyers LaRocco
Cooper Laughlin
Costello Lehman (CA)
Cox (IL) Lent
Coyne Levin (MI)
Cramer Lewis (GA)
Darden Lipinski
de la Garza Lloyd
DeFazio Long
DeLauro Lowey (NY)
Dellums Luken
Derrick Machtley
Dicks Manton
Dingell Markey
Dixon Martinez
Donnelly Matsui
Dooley Mavroules
Dorkan (ND) Mazzoli
Downey McCloskey
Durbin McCurdy
Dwyer McDermott
Dymally McHugh
Early McMillen (MD)
Eckart McNulty
Edwards (CA) Mfume
Edwards (TX) Miller (CA)
Engel Mineta
English Mink
Espy Mollohan
Evans Montgomery
Fascell Moody
Fazio Moran
Feighan Mrazek
Foglietta Murphy
Ford (MI) Murtha
Ford (TN) Nagle
Frank (MA) Natcher
Franks (CT) Neal (MA)
Frost Neal (NC)
Gaydos Nowak
Gejdenson Oaker
Gephardt Oberstar
Geren Obey

NOES—178

Allard Bentley Camp
Allen Bereuter Carper
Armey Billirakis Chandler
Atkins Bliley Clinger
Baker Boehlert Coble
Ballenger Boehner Coleman (MO)
Barnard Broomfield Combust
Barrett Bunning Condit
Barton Burton Coughlin
Bateman Callahan Cox (CA)

Crane Cunningham
Davis Jontz
DeLay Kasich
Dickinson Klug
Doolittle Kolbe
Dornan (CA) Kyl
Dreier Lagomarsino
Duncan Leach
Edwards (OK) Lewis (CA)
Emerson Lewis (FL)
Erdreich Lightfoot
Ewing Livingston
Fawell Lowery (CA)
Fields Marlenee
Fish Martin
Galleghy McCandless
Gallo McCollum
Gekas McCrery
Gilchrest McDade
Gillmor McEwen
Gilman McGrath
Gingrich McMillan (NC)
Goodling Meyers
Goss Michel
Gradison Miller (OH)
Grandy Miller (WA)
Gunderson Molinari
Hall (TX) Moorhead
Hammerschmidt Morella
Hancock Morrison
Hansen Myers
Harris Nichols
Hastert Nussle
Hefley Olin
Henry Orton
Herger Oxley
Hobson Packard
Holloway Patterson
Hopkins Paxon
Houghton Payne (VA)
Hubbard Petri
Huckaby Pickett
Hunter Porter
Hutto Pursell
Hyde Quillen
Inhofe Ramstad
Ireland Ravenel
Jacobs Regula
James Rhodes
Ridge

NOT VOTING—16

Archer Flake
AuCoin Kolter
Boxer Lehman (FL)
Byron Levine (CA)
Campbell (CA) Moakley
Dannemeyer Pastor

□ 1319

Mr. JACOBS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 452 PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4111, SMALL BUSINESS CREDIT CRUNCH RELIEF ACT OF 1992

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-515) on the resolution (H. Res. 452) providing for the consideration of H.R. 4111 to amend the Small Business Act to provide additional loan assistance to small businesses, and for other purposes which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

A COMPREHENSIVE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ANTITRUST POLICY

(Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Antitrust Reform Act of 1992, a bill that will establish in law a sound and broad-based competition policy that will guide the country's telecommunications industry into the 21st century.

Unfortunately, in this most important of industries, we are witnessing the piecemeal unraveling of the 1982 AT&T consent decree, also known as the modification of final judgment, or MFJ. That decree was the culmination of 8 years of antitrust litigation by the Department of Justice against AT&T's telecommunications monopoly. Under the terms of the MFJ, AT&T agreed to divest its competitive local monopoly phone service, while retaining its long distance and manufacturing operations. The local divested Bell companies reorganized into seven regional Bell operating companies [RBOCs]. In addition, under the terms of the MFJ, the monopoly RBOC companies were prohibited from entering competitive lines of business—information services, telecommunications equipment manufacturing and long distance services. This restriction was intended to assure that the RBOCs did not unfairly exploit their monopoly position in local telephone service. The MFJ prohibitions were intended to continue until there was no substantial possibility the RBOC could use its monopoly power to impede competition in a given line of business.

Recently, the comprehensive competitive framework of the MFJ has come under assault. The U.S. Court of Appeals rejected, on procedural grounds, application of the decree's competitive entry test to the information services restriction and instructed U.S. District Court Judge Greene to apply an entry test that, in Judge Greene's view, all but mandated that he remove that restriction. His decision removing the restriction is now on appeal. Meanwhile, the Senate has passed legislation which would remove the decree's manufacturing restriction. These activities are occurring against a backdrop of lax agency oversight and deregulation.

The legislation I am introducing is based on the competitive principles of the MFJ and takes a properly balanced approach in dealing with the Nation's crucial telecommunications industry. The bill recognizes the capabilities of the RBOCs to make significant and innovative contributions to our Nation's technological development by permitting them to seek orderly entry into competitive lines of business on a phased basis over the next several years. RBOCs would be granted the flexibility to seek entry with regard to a particular product or geographic market within a competitive line of business, or with regard to a line of business in its entirety. Because of concerns expressed that the MFJ prevents RBOCs from participating in the research and development sphere or from adequately providing products and services to the disabled where no one else is able to, the bill authorizes the RBOCs to seek entry with regard to these activities immediately upon the bill's enactment.

My bill will ensure that the robust competition that has developed in the telecommunications industry under the MFJ is protected against monopoly abuse. The bill requires that prior to entry into a competitive line of business, the RBOC must establish that there is no substantial possibility that it could use its monopoly power to impede competition in the market for which entry is sought. This competitive entry test is based on the entry test that lies at the heart of the MFJ. The bill would apply this test comprehensively to all new market entries. However, in order to avoid disruption of previously sanctioned RBOC activities, the bill includes a savings clause for waivers previously issued under the MFJ's own competitive entry test, as well as for the activities of the RBOC's research consortium, Bellcore.

Once an RBOC has been allowed into a line of business, the antitrust laws would, of course, continue to apply. There would also be specific antitrust safeguards, based on the principles and administration of the MFJ, against anticompetitive discrimination and cross-subsidization, and against the RBOC's recombining. The bill also requires the RBOC's to advise their officers and management personnel of their obligations under the act—and requires the RBOC CEO—or other responsible officer—to annually certify compliance to the Attorney General. The bill's protections would be enforced by the full array of traditional antitrust remedies, including criminal penalties, civil enforcement by the Department of Justice and private rights of action for treble damages or injunctive relief.

This bill is being introduced following extensive hearings conducted by the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Economic and Commercial Law during the 102d Congress. The subcommittee has received testimony from a wide range of interested parties, including the RBOC's, information service providers, equipment manufacturers, long distance companies, labor and consumer groups, and Federal and State regulators and law enforcement officials.

I urge all of my colleagues to work for swift passage of this important and timely legislation.

VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER AND SUBSTITUTING 15-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER ON MAY 12, 1992

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate my 5-minute special order on Tuesday, May 12, 1992, and in lieu thereof ask permission to address the House for 15 minutes during special orders at the appropriate time on May 12.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably detained this morning and was not

present for rollcall votes 108 on the approval of the Journal, and 109 to table the motion to appeal the Speaker's ruling. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on both votes.

RESCINDING CERTAIN BUDGET AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Pursuant to House Resolution 447 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4990.

□ 1320

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4990) rescinding certain budget authority, and for other purposes, with Mr. GLICKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the House faces an unusual situation today—one which concerns us all as it does the people of the Nation.

What we bring you today is from our Committee on Appropriations which I have the honor to head. In the preparation of this bill and the report, of course, we have had the benefit of the counsel of all the members of the committee and the very fine staff of our committee. I present it on behalf of the committee today after discussions by our committee with leaders of various agencies of the executive branch and based on our experience of years of service on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, it is through our appropriations bills that we make the public investments in roads, bridges, harbors, airports, science, education, research and development, law enforcement, housing, environmental protection, and many other important areas that will keep our country growing and prospering into the 21st century.

Last year the committee in 13 separate appropriations bills appropriated \$728,655,000,000 in over 1,200 appropriations accounts to fund the agencies which carry out programs vital to the nation in every area of the country. In preparing for those bills, the committee took testimony from over 5,200 witnesses in 271 hearing days of testimony.

Each one of those bills was presented to the full committee by the appropriate subcommittee. The committee took action on the subcommittee recommendations and reported those bills to the House.

Those bills were then considered in the House. Amendments were offered, some were adopted, some were defeated. Each bill passed the House and went to the Senate. The Senate passed 12 of those bills, and we brought back conference reports on those 12 bills, and those conference reports were debated. Amendments in disagreement were debated, and identical conference agreements were adopted by the House and by the Senate.

The bills were presented to the President. Ten of those bills were signed. Two of the bills were vetoed because of abortion language. Bills with the objectionable language removed passed the House, passed the Senate, and were signed by the President. The President did not veto a single appropriations bill last year because of the total funding amount or because of changes in priority that the Congress made to his proposals.

Now, for whatever reason, the President has proposed rescissions of \$5,663,000,000 in messages transmitted March 10, March 20, and April 8. The committee, as it has when rescission proposals have been proposed by the President ever since 1975, carefully considered those proposals and, through the subcommittee process—the same process that produced the appropriations bills that the President signed less than 6 months ago—agreed to rescind more than the President proposed.

The President says we need to reduce Federal spending in order to reduce the deficit.

Mr. Chairman, the deficit is not caused by your Committee on Appropriations. Since 1945, the committee has reduced the Presidents' budget requests by \$188,800,000,000. Since 1975, we have rescinded \$1,608,000,000 more than the Presidents have proposed to be rescinded.

Mr. Chairman, you can eliminate all domestic discretionary spending in fiscal year 1992, and you will not eliminate the deficit for fiscal year 1992. The only way the deficit will be reduced, in my opinion, is to increase productive employment in the United States and in the process expand the revenue base.

In the last 10 years, our trade deficit has increased by over a trillion dollars. I know it is growing less now than last year, and I am glad of that, but the fact is, the trade deficit is still growing.

America needs to produce more and export more. We need to regain our normal domestic and foreign markets.

We need to make investments in America, investments in assets—education, highways, rivers, harbors, in-

vestments that will improve access to markets; investments that will rebuild our deteriorating highways, our deteriorating water systems, our deteriorating public structures. Investments that will help us compete.

This investment will stimulate private investment, and we need to make sure that those private investments are made in America.

Mr. Chairman, we have considered the rescission proposals before the committee, agreed to many of them and added some of our own based on what the committee, through its subcommittees, knows about changing priorities in programs administered in the executive branch.

Changing priorities and conditions always result in a chance to make rescissions. We do this every year, normally in our regular bills.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friends, BILL NATCHER, NEAL SMITH, SID YATES, DAVE OBEY, ED ROYBAL, TOM BEVILL, JACK MURTHA, BOB TRAXLER, BILL LEHMAN, JULIAN DIXON, VIC FAZIO, BILL HEFNER—our fine subcommittee chairmen—JOE MCDADE, JOHN MYERS, LARRY COUGHLIN, RALPH REGULA, CARL PURSELL, MICKEY EDWARDS, BILL GREEN, JERRY LEWIS, HAL ROGERS, JOE SKEEN, FRANK WOLF, BILL LOWERY, and DEAN GALLO—our ranking Republicans—along with all our other fine committee members who have held the hearings to produce our bills over the years. Their assistance has also been invaluable in the preparation of the bill we are considering today.

Mr. Chairman, the reported bill before the House is the product of 11 subcommittees including two areas the President didn't propose—legislative branch and foreign operations.

The bill includes many rescissions recommended by the President as well as others initiated by the subcommittees to reflect other priorities.

The bill rescinds a total of \$5,804,621,975 comprising \$4,946,859,000 from military spending; \$123,813,975 from international affairs; and \$733,949,000 from domestic programs.

The committee can be proud of its performance.

Since 1945 the total of appropriations bills has been \$188.8 billion below the totals requested by Presidents.

The total of the fiscal year 1992 appropriations bills was below the budget caps and the President's budget request. We were consistent with the budget ceiling and no sequester was necessary.

The bill reported by the committee rescinds \$141,649,285 more than the President proposed to rescind in his March 10, March 20, and April 8 rescission messages, and in each subcommittee we met or exceeded the President's dollar figures.

Since 1974, excluding the messages under consideration and the action recommended in this bill, the Congress

has rescinded \$1,607,770,488 more than the various President's have proposed.

Since the rescission process began in 1974 and through March 9, 1992, the GAO has certified the following:

Rescissions proposed by President	918
Total amount proposed by President for rescission	\$61,408,560,900
Number of proposals enacted by Congress	324
Total amount of proposals enacted by Congress	\$19,311,454,366
Number of new rescissions initiated by Congress	370
Total amount of rescissions initiated by Congress	\$43,704,877,022
Grand total:	
Number of rescissions enacted	694
Amount of rescissions enacted	\$63,016,331,388
Amount rescinded in excess of Presidents requests	\$1,607,770,488

The bill does not address the \$2.2 billion of defense rescissions proposed by the President on April 9. In developing the bill, our subcommittees had to complete their work prior to the recess in order to meet our full committee markup schedule. This did not permit the April 9 messages to be considered in this bill. We understand additional rescission messages may be proposed. A subsequent rescission bill will be developed to handle this situation.

The rescission process prescribes that if, after 45 calendar days of continuous session, enactment of any proposed rescission has not occurred then the funding for the proposed rescission should be made available. The time for that occurrence is mid May for some, for the President's proposals that are in this bill. Based on past occurrences, when a rescission bill is moving through the last stages and 45 days have expired, obligations of proposed rescission funding by the executive branch does not occur immediately on the proposed rescissions expired on May 17, and yet the bill was not enacted into law until July 5. If enactment of this bill has not occurred by mid May, we would expect the impact of funding obligations on amounts in this bill to be minimal, as we continue to move the bill toward enactment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think all of us recognize and realize why we are here today. The American people are demanding that we reduce spending.

During the last several months the President has sent a number of messages to the Congress and to the House of Representatives, particularly the Committee on Appropriations, totaling 224 rescissions. The Appropriations Committee has reviewed those rescissions and has adopted some of them in this bill, but they also made some of

their own after careful analysis of where we were on spending for 1992 and the outreach years of 1993 and 1994. The President's message totaled \$5,662,673,690. This bill, the committee bill, totals \$5,804,621,975, about \$142 million more than the President's request. Of this the committee would rescind in that proposal by the President \$2,570,636,000. In the President's request there would be that amount of money rescinded from his request. We added more than \$3 billion of our own reductions. Of the total amount contained in this bill, \$142 million of this would be larger than the President's, but within that approximately \$4,950,000,000 would come from national defense and military construction. Of that amount is \$50 billion the President has asked to be reduced in spending in the next 5 years from defense, and this is all part of that package. However, the President recommended the cancellation of the construction of two submarines, the Seawolf class, nuclear powered, attack submarines. The committee found that we had already purchased a lot of equipment to build the first submarine, and some even to build a second submarine. We found that the termination costs in closing out the Seawolf Program would run as much, and maybe even more, and we would have nothing to show for it.

Your committee has recommended that we continue construction of one Seawolf class submarine now under construction, and terminate the second one, which would be the third one in the inventory.

□ 1330

One hundred ten million in this bill would come from foreign aid. The President made no request for any cuts in foreign aid. Your committee felt that we could cut \$110 million from foreign aid.

We also included a \$20 million reduction in the legislative branch which the President, by the rule of comity, did not include. The \$20 million would come from mailing costs.

The bill also contains about a \$600 million reduction in housing programs, in the HUD rescissions.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. We have had a lot of debate on the rule, considering that the selection of what programs to be canceled or terminated was different. I have been around here for a long time. The President and the Congress have never agreed on very many rescissions. We have ours and we include some of his in this bill.

I do think we have a bill, a bill I think every Member here could defend and should support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as you and the other members of the committee know, the

authority for the bill, H.R. 4990, the rescission bill, is provided for in the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

President Bush proposed in his March 10, March 20, and April 8 messages 99 rescissions, totaling \$5,662,973,000 within the jurisdiction of 9 of our 13 subcommittees.

When our chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and the other chairmen of the subcommittees finished their sections of the bill, 11 of our subcommittees made recommendations for rescissions that are now in this bill.

A reduction of \$5,804,622,000 was approved in the full committee. This, Mr. Chairman, is \$141,694,000 more than the amount requested by President Bush. We approved 66 rescissions out of President Bush's 99 requests.

Mr. Chairman, this bill rescinds \$4,947,000,000 from military spending. It rescinds \$123,814,000 from international affairs, and \$733,949,000 from domestic programs.

As I pointed out, 11 of the 13 subcommittees are involved in this bill, 2 more than were requested by the President. The Subcommittee on Legislation, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], and the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], both recommended additional reductions. In the case of the legislative branch, we have \$20 million which was the amount saved as far as franking of the mail is concerned.

For the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, we have rescissions added to the bill of \$123,800,000.

Mr. Chairman, I support the committee bill presented by my chairman, JAMIE WHITTEN of Mississippi. Mr. WHITTEN, as the Members know, is the most senior Member of the House having set the all-time service record on January 6 of this year. Mr. WHITTEN has again used his 50 years of experience to put together a bill which addresses the needs of the country and the needs of this House. No Member of the Congress cares more about the House of Representatives than Mr. WHITTEN. With his leadership, the committee has produced a good bill which should be supported by both sides of the aisle. I am pleased to support my chairman on this legislation just as he has always supported the bills for labor, health and human services, and education which come from the subcommittee which I chair. He always helps us and we appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good rescission bill, and we recommend it to the committee.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a few minutes ago said that Americans need to produce more and export more so we can create more jobs here in America, and I agree with that.

The problem is because we spend too much and we tax too much and we add mandates onto the back of the business community, we are losing our competitive edge. When we tax more and spend more and the businessman and citizens of this country have to pay more in taxes, this means they have to make more in salaries, all of those additional taxes go onto the back of the product that the businessman produces.

Because of that, when he exports overseas he is no longer competitive because it costs more to produce a car or a refrigerator or all kinds of products, because we are taxing more than our competitors overseas.

So when we start talking about these spending bills like we are today, these rescissions, we are not just talking about making one cut today and that is the end of it. We are talking about something that has a pyramiding effect throughout our economy.

Today the President sent \$5.7 billion in rescissions up to the Hill for us to act upon. Because of the rule we passed, we will not be able to pass that \$5.7 billion in cuts, because the minute we vote on that, and it will pass, the next vote will negate that previous vote, because we have this king-of-the-hill provision.

So the American people will once again be hurt to the tune of \$5.7 billion in rescissions that could be made today.

Mr. Chairman, the people across this country do not trust Congress very much. The last poll I saw showed that 17 percent of the American people hold this body in high regard. That means that 83 percent of the people question the integrity and ability of us to cope with the Nation's problems. One of the reasons they have this doubt is because of the antics that you are seeing here today.

Mr. Chairman, that rule obfuscates the issue. What we need to do is cut through all the muck and let the American people know where the real problems lie. The real problem lies with the big spenders in this body. We have been able to cover it up to date with this rule so nobody is going to be able to understand it, the average person out there. But there is one place you can find out, and that is from the National Taxpayers Union.

Mr. Chairman, the National Taxpayers Union puts out a rating chart each year on how Congressmen and Congresswomen vote. I want to tell you, of the 226 biggest spenders in the U.S. House of Representatives, according to the National Taxpayers Union, 5 were Republicans and 221 were Democrats. Five of the biggest spenders in

the Congress were Republicans and 221 were Democrats.

Mr. Chairman, that is the problem, and that is something that the American people have to address this fall. We have one Member here from Vermont, a man who is a Socialist. He ran on the Socialist Party ticket and was elected. There are 226 Members that have a worse voting record than the only Socialist in this country, and the American people do not want socialism.

So if the American people want to change things around this Nation, they ought to elect people who are for fiscal responsibility and who are going to keep taxes in line and keep spending down so we can be competitive in the world market.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, but I just want to point out what is happening here today because it is unique. We have each year had rescission proposals submitted by the President. He would package a number of ideas he had for rescissions into a special message.

This year we are dealing in this bill with 99 separate rescission messages that the President submitted. There are a total of 113 rescissions in the committee bill because we included some proposed by the President and added some more.

Now, there is nothing unusual about having a midyear correction in the budget. We usually require some supplementals and probably some rescissions. When you are dealing with the large amount of money that we deal with in the Federal budget, of course, in the midterm you need some kind of correction.

But what the President did was to submit 99 separate rescission messages. I understand OMB has a list down there of 360.

Now, what was the President's criteria for the rescission proposals? It was not necessarily elimination of pork barrel projects. The criteria was not what is bad or good. The criteria is were these items in the original fiscal year 1992 budget submitted to the Congress last year?

I asked some of the agency witnesses that came before my subcommittee what was the criteria. They indicated that was a criteria.

□ 1340

Now, that is not a criterion for determining what is needed or what should be a midyear correction at all. That is just a criterion for setting up the Congress so that we cannot get our work done.

Under the rules, each one of these rescissions could take in excess of 3 hours. If they could tie us up on 99 rescissions for that much time, we could not do anything until summer.

Then we would see stories on television that Congress can't get its work done, Congress can't get its work done.

What was done in this bill was to package these rescissions. That is the reason we had an argument on the rule. That is the only reason there was an argument on the rule. We packaged the rescissions into a bill so that we do not have to take 2 months to do what we can do here in a few hours.

This is a bill that packages some of the President's rescissions, substitutes some new ones in place of his proposals and adds others that the committee thought were needed or were justified. The committee bill then takes care of 113 rescissions all at one time. So I think this is the way to handle this matter.

I urge a "yes" vote on the bill.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY].

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee's appropriations bill. I applaud the President, who felt that as the world was changing, we needed to reduce our spending, particularly our defense spending.

We are going to reduce our defense spending. I think it has to be done in a way which permits us to make a transition from an economy in many States and parts of the world which was geared to defense to one which is geared to civilian technology.

As we make that transition, we cannot destroy an industrial base that has taken us in many cases decades to build. The President chose to eliminate the Seawolf submarine. Fortunately, we have had committee hearings in the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations has considered this decision, and new information has come up.

In fact, we now know that it would cost us \$1.9 billion to terminate that contract, and we would have no additional Seawolf submarines. Or we could spend the \$2.7 billion and get 2 additional submarines. It seems to make elementary, economic, reasonable sense that we could go forward and build additional Seawolf submarines. Not 10, 12, but the 2 that we have already authorized and appropriated.

This world is changing. We must recognize the changes. But as we are looking at how we are going to cut back in our budget, and we must cut back, we have a \$400 billion deficit which my children and my colleagues' children are going to have to pay, we must reduce our deficit, but we must do it in a responsible manner.

I believe the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman and the leadership on both sides, have tried to work. We are not looking at a package that the Committee on Appropriations has put together which is less than the

President's proposal. In fact, it cuts more. In fact, we are looking at a package which is \$141 million more.

Every Member in this room, every Member can probably stand up and say, "I would like to see cuts in different areas." And frankly, that is not possible, to meet every Member's satisfaction.

I believe the committee has done a credible and outstanding job in recognizing the strategic needs of our Nation, looking at the economic impacts of the decisions and putting together a proposal which takes care of all of our needs.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my extreme opposition to the proposed rescission of over \$4 million for the Low Income Heating Assistance Program.

The Low Income Heating Assistance Program also known as LIHEAP, serves over 6 million families nationwide and nearly 60 percent of all LIHEAP recipients are families with incomes under \$6,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to consider the significant message a rescission of this sort will send to the States regarding Federal support for LIHEAP. The LIHEAP rescission in H.R. 4990 would deny States a portion of the promised Federal LIHEAP funds, leaving the States to make up the difference. Currently, States lend money to their LIHEAP with the understanding that they will receive Government assistance at the end of each fiscal year. Should this rescission occur, it will appear that the Federal Government has reneged on its promise of distributing specified money to the LIHEAP. With less Federal support, State programs will ultimately be forced to make further cuts in benefits and eligibility.

Mr. Chairman, reductions in LIHEAP will cause real pain for real people. Without this program, far too many families, disabled and elderly on a fixed income will have to choose between heating and eating. I urge my colleagues to join me in my strong opposition to the LIHEAP rescission and implore the eventual House conferees to work with their colleagues in the Senate to find alternatives to this rescission.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the point that while the administration did not ask for any spending cuts in the area of foreign aid, that the committee, in its alternative, has produced a proposal which reduces foreign aid by \$110 million. \$32 million in IDA, withholding money that cannot be spent in China because of human rights problems, \$56 million in military grant aid, including \$39 million to Peru, a government which just threw its democratically elected politicians in jail, and a number of other miscellaneous items.

We provided these cuts because we felt it was simply not credible nor balanced to provide cuts in the domestic side of the ledger without doing the same thing in the area of foreign aid.

I would also like to make the point in response to the gentleman who com-

mented three speakers ago that the fact is that this committee has more than met its obligations in terms of budget discipline.

I recognize there are some Members in this House who would rather play partisan or ideological games on virtually every bill in sight rather than simply dealing with the public's business in a sensible way, but the fact is that this proposal cuts more money than the President's original request.

In fact, as has been indicated previously, since the rescission process began in 1974, the GAO has certified that the Congress has cut \$1.6 billion more in rescissions than Presidents during that time asked for.

It seems to me the record is clear. This committee has met its responsibility to respond to requests to rescind. We have exceeded the spending reductions recommended by the White House historically, as we do again today. And I think this package is much better balanced and much less political, frankly, than the original package.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, last summer my good friend and colleague, TIM PENNY, and I offered an amendment to cut \$21 million in mail funds from the fiscal year 1992 legislative branch appropriations bill. We fell just 22 votes short of success. While this vote was considered a key vote by several congressional watchdog groups, I'll bet most Representatives' constituents were unaware of how their Congressperson voted.

Today, however, Congress is under stricter scrutiny than ever before. We're all under the intense magnifying glass of an angry public. The winds of change are blowing even more strongly around here. Our constituents are watching us more closely, expecting us to be responsible and accountable.

I am pleased that the members of the Appropriations Committee now agree with the supporters of the last summer's Penny-Upton amendment, that we did not need this \$20 million for our mail. I am voting in favor of the rescission package, and consequently, supporting for the second time language that cuts \$20 million from fiscal year 1992's House franking fund.

While this cut is a solid start, we need additional congressional franking reforms. I urge my colleagues not only to cut mail funds, but also to prohibit any excess funds from being recycled to other projects, as is currently allowed. I commend Congressman JERRY LEWIS for his efforts in this arena. Both Republicans and Democrats have signed up to cosponsor my bill, House Resolution 404, which would mandate any unused franking funds be returned to the Treasury.

We also must stop the practice of allowing Members to send mass mailings

to residents of counties they don't yet represent. Congressman BILL THOMAS, another leader in House reform, has introduced H.R. 4104 to stop this practice, and I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of his bill.

Finally, let's kill both Seawolf submarines, which are what I call ill-begotten Groton goods. With the fall of communism, they are simply unneeded, and efforts to restore them by traditional defense budget cutters is a clear example of pork. We must be willing to make tough choices.

These actions will help us get our own fiscal house in order and help restore the faith of the American people in their government. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of them.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I am also on the Legislative Branch Subcommittee. Even though I may have voted against the Lewis amendment at the time it was offered in full committee markup, I had one of the lowest mailings of any Member of the House.

I would say that many of the Members that voted for the Lewis amendment had much higher mailings than I had.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURTHA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's point. I think it really needs to be said that it was the Frenzel amendments which really restricted our mailing by each individual office in relation to our population differences by constituency that made it possible for us to provide this rescission today.

The vote that we were asked to make in a prior Congress really did not flow out of those reforms. So I think the gentleman can be satisfied that he has done the right thing, and we are all proceeding in the right direction on the frank.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, the details of the committee's Defense recommendations are in the report accompanying this bill.

At the time the Defense Subcommittee marked up the rescission bill, the subcommittee had received proposed rescissions totaling \$4.8 billion.

The recommendations contained in this bill rescind \$5 million more than the total requested by the administration.

In terms of the overall Defense chapter in this bill, the committee agreed with more than one-half of the funds requested for rescission by the Pentagon, and the committee provided alternative rescissions for the other half.

The alternative rescissions recommended by the committee are in a wide variety of programs and recommended for rescission for a variety

of reasons including: unobligated balances; low priority; poor execution; and lack of support from the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The bill before you does not recommend rescinding all of the funds requested for rescission regarding the Seawolf submarine.

The bill preserves the option of procuring two Seawolf submarines as opposed to one recommended by the DOD.

If we rescinded funds for the second Seawolf submarine, a total of \$918 million would have been expended and we would have nothing to show for it.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, the Defense chapter: Rescinds more funds than the level of rescissions requested by the Department of Defense; preserves the option of constructing a second Seawolf submarine; and rescinds low priority programs.

I recommend approval of the committee's recommendations in the Defense chapter of the rescission bill.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, many of the Members are speaking very knowledgeably about the details of this issue, and I do not want to do that. I want to talk more about what I think is the policy direction and the commonsense approach to what we are doing here, and the broader question of what we are really dealing with.

Certainly most of us, all of us, I think, would admit there is nothing more important than effectively dealing with the deficit. That has been my view since I have been here for 3 years. It is my view every weekend when I go home to Wyoming. That is the issue that most people put as the highest priority.

The evidence, of course, is that we are unable to deal with the deficit without making some procedural changes that need to be made. One is the balanced budget amendment, so we have some constitutional discipline to do it. Another is to change the budget procedure so that we handle it differently.

The one we are talking about here today really is the line-item veto, and I wish we had a line-item veto, as most of us perceive it, where every issue has to come before this House that is vetoed by the President.

However, this is an approach to dealing with it. The bundling issue is the one that kills us, I believe. Many of the things that go through in these large bills would never stand scrutiny on their own, and that is what this bill is all about.

Mr. Chairman, I just really hope that we can put this thing as close as can be to a line-item veto, not to put one package together, leave out a bunch of other stuff, and say, "We have fixed it." That does not fix it. We need a procedural operation so we can do this and

we can deal with those items that are hidden down in this budget.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the committee for the work that it has done. It has reached in. It has been able to save more tax dollars than the President's proposal, and it has done so in a far more rational process. I want the people who are watching this, both here and at home, to understand what the debate is about. The debate is whether elected Members of Congress make the determination on where we save the money or whether a handful of appointed, removed bureaucrats make those decisions, because if we make the decision based on what process saves more money, it is the committee that deserves the great credit of having saved more dollars at the end of the day, but it has done so in a process that I think takes into better accounting the value of the American tax dollars.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned the submarine program, the choice of spending \$91.1 for a lot of parts that do not add up for anything, or spending slightly more in order to have a ship for the fleet.

Time and time again it seems to me the committee has made the right decisions. It has made the cost savings that will bring the deficit down, not as much as many of us would clearly like, but we need to do other things as well, not just within the appropriations process but in tax policy and in other places as well.

Therefore, I for one want to commend the committee for its great work in this budget process, and would hope that my colleagues will join with me in supporting it.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I certainly thank the gentleman for this time.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very clear that I do support the rescission effort here of the Committee on Appropriations. I hope that what we have been debating today in regard to the total questions involved here are not construed to be deeply critical, at least insofar as what the Committee on Appropriations has done here, I believe in a good faith effort to try to answer the President when the President suggested that there ought to be, in his first two messages, on March 10 and March 20 about \$5.8 billion of rescissions in some 68, I believe, rescission messages.

To the credit of the Committee on Appropriations, they addressed that question. I believe they incorporated \$2.6 billion of the President's rescissions within the Committee on Appro-

priations' rescissions, so that is all, I think, a plus.

We in the pork busters group have not been criticizing what the House Committee on Appropriations has done to try to address this problem. Our real argument has been with the Committee on Rules, because what we have suggested or tried to suggest, considering the fact that we have been unable to balance the budget for 23 years in a row, and we are incurring about \$300 billion this year just to pay interest on the national debt, we all agree that anything we can do to address ourselves to low priority spending, which is easy to say but tough to do, we should do that.

Thus, in a bipartisan fashion, Democrats and Republicans got together, went to the Committee on Rules, and we offered suggestions as to how we could add to and we could complement what the Committee on Appropriations was doing. At that time, by the way, and at this time, the President has suggested \$7.9 billion in rescissions. That is more than what the Committee on Appropriations has suggested, but in all fairness, the Committee on Appropriations began their deliberations, I believe, when the President's rescissions were at about the \$5.8 billion figure, so they addressed themselves to that.

At this time, however, we try to bring out that the President has \$7.9 billion worth of rescissions, \$2.6 billion have been incorporated into the Committee on Appropriations plan, and that is all to the good.

However, why not now let the President have at least an opportunity to have this body consider being able to, in a separate amendment, address ourselves to what the remaining balance of the President's rescissions are, even in a packaged plan where we do not have the project-by-project vote the President ought to have? That is all we are suggesting.

We did show we could add \$6.6 billion to what the Committee on Appropriations has done, and we are being struck out completely in that regard. Our frustration is not with the Committee on Appropriations this time, our frustration is with the Committee on Rules.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, our Appropriations Committee considered the President's rescission requests.

The committee has given us a balanced, rational rescission list that incorporates many of the President's requests, substitutes others, and would cut even more than the President requested.

So let's not try to kid anyone that savings are the issue here.

Of particular concern to me is the mean-spirited political nature of some

of the objections to items in this proposal.

I refer especially to \$1.2 million for Hawaiian Homes lands infrastructure.

The Hawaiian Homes Program was established by Congress in 1921.

Its goal is housing for native Hawaiians and the reestablishment of Hawaiian communities.

In establishing the Hawaiian Homes Program, Congress attempted in some measure to ameliorate the injustice done to the Hawaiian people by the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893.

That overthrow was, to put it bluntly, an armed coup d'etat executed by American citizens backed by the armed crew and big guns of the U.S.S. *Boston*.

As we approach the centennial of that coup, the Hawaiian people are still suffering the aftershocks of that event.

They are overrepresented in nearly every index of social distress—lower life expectancy, illness, homelessness, unemployment.

Native Hawaiians are becoming strangers in their own land.

The Federal Government—the administration's claims to the contrary notwithstanding—does have a trust obligation here.

That trust obligation began with the enactment of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act in 1921.

It was acknowledged by successive administrations throughout Hawaii's territorial period and long after Hawaii became a State.

It is only the Bush administration which refuses to acknowledge—much less honor—that relationship.

That rejection of Hawaii's native race is exemplified in this rescission.

I ask every Member to join me in rejecting this amendment and achieving—just this once—a small measure of justice for the Hawaiian people.

□ 1400

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, does anyone recall when former President Reagan ran for office on the need for a balanced budget and used to say things such as any President that submits a budget that is unbalanced ought to be impeached? Well, except for that original budget in January 1981, which was just a minor change from the Carter budget, the President of the United States never submitted a balanced budget, and yet it has been the Congress that year after year has appropriated less than the President has requested, cut taxes by \$1.6 trillion, increased expenditures by \$1 trillion. The fact is that the American public needs to know that the Congress has appropriated less and rescinded each year more than the White House has proposed, \$17.23 billion in total. Even this legislation reduces the administra-

tion's request by \$142 million, and beyond that, it is a thoughtful approach to budgeting. In fact, it addresses the changing needs of our Nation, puts the money where it needs to be, and reflects the American public's concern for fiscal integrity.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4990, legislation introduced by Chairman WHITTEN which offers a thoughtful, constructive, and responsible alternative to the rescission package offered by the administration.

Throughout the 1980's Congress has demonstrated more fiscal restraint and more fiscal responsibility than either Presidents Reagan or Bush. Since President Reagan took office, Congress has appropriated less and rescinded each year more than the White House proposed—\$17.23 billion total. Even this legislation takes the administration one step further in decreasing the Federal budget—to the tune of \$142 million.

But aside from the true track record of what branch of the Federal Government is controlling Federal spending, this legislation offered by Chairman WHITTEN is more reflective of the changing needs of our Nation. I support the increased rescission of some unnecessary weapons programs such as procurement of MX missiles and advanced cruise missiles. I also support the necessary cuts made to the domestic side of the President's rescission list. All these cuts demonstrate the willingness to make the hard choices which are necessary to bring our budget deficits under control.

I urge my colleagues to support this rescission package.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think the bill has been adequately discussed and explained here, but a few things still seem to be hanging out there. Some Members do not fully understand the bill.

The biggest difference between the President's recommendations for rescissions and ours is the Seawolf submarine program. We can take the President's bill, knock the Seawolf program out and we save very few dollars and we would have absolutely nothing to show for it. If we go on and consider the Seawolf and build a second Seawolf, which would be from equipment most of which is already purchased, and there would be no termination costs on that, we will at least have an attack submarine to show for what we have invested.

But even more importantly, the military-industrial base that is represented in this program would be lost entirely if we terminate this program. Hopefully we will never need it, but it takes a long time to put all of those people together, the capability, the talents that are already there. So it is going to

be reduced, but at least we will have that capability, that cadre of talent maintained by the committee's recommendation.

Lastly, if Members are just interested in saving money, the most dollars will be saved by the committee's recommendations, \$141,649,285 more than the President recommended. So if that is your interest, support the committee bill.

We are going to have an opportunity shortly to hear about the President's program and what it will cut out, and that will be discussed later. But the most dollars will be saved by the committee program, and if Members are concerned about saving dollars, my guess is we will have this thing around again, and there will be more opportunities this year to vote on rescissions.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is the best rescission bill that has been presented to the Congress since 1974 when the Budget Impoundment and Control Act was passed. Prior to this time when we received rescission requests from the President, those requests were considered by the subcommittee when the hearings were being held, and if approved they would be forwarded in the regular appropriations bill. This is a separate bill. It is the largest stand-alone rescission bill that has ever been considered. Mr. Chairman, we recommend this bill to the Committee.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that today this body will vote on real spending cuts. H.R. 4990 represents the first time in my career that the House of Representatives is debating and voting a piece of legislation which will reduce Federal spending. This legislation contains funding cuts for many programs. However, the majority of the savings, about 85 percent of them, are made from cuts in Defense appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking Republican on the Defense Industrial Base Panel I have examined closely the effect the proposed defense reductions will have on our defense industrial base. As you know, the conclusions we reached were complex and did not have simple solutions—to be frank, a Band-Aid approach not only won't work, but it is dangerous. Let's not repeat history and simply cut for the sake of a peace dividend.

Albeit, there are some industries that can make the transition despite the distinct difference between the commercial and defense industry. However, there are others that are unique and, therefore, require a unique approach. One of these is the shipbuilding industry—more specifically submarines. Simply put, it is not a technology that can be easily transferred to many other applications besides defense. As a result, we risk the possibility of not only losing the technological base, but also jeopardizing our countries' national security.

The skills that are needed to build submarines cannot be learned overnight. They

have taken years to reach this level, a level which has given our country superiority on the seas unmatched by any other country. While communism may be gone, the weapons of mass destruction it produced are not—and that includes submarines. Our ability to deter aggression relies on our strengths and our ability to rapidly respond.

By halting production, even on a temporary basis, we cannot expect those skills to survive. People are not something you put on a shelf and take down next time they are needed. Not only will we lose the confidence of the people who design and produce submarines, but we also lose the ability to reconstitute in time of conflict. The loss of one shipyard will ensure that those abilities are lost.

Aside from my concerns with the defense industrial base, I am very supportive of this bill. I am, and have been, a supporter of the constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget. I hope that the House conferees will give serious consideration to including the Senate's provision on a balanced budget amendment in the legislation they report back to the House of Representatives.

I will vote for this bill which is the first opportunity I have had in Congress to further reduce the level of Federal spending, especially wasteful spending. I believe this is an important first step in regaining control of Federal spending levels.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, what is encouraging about the legislation before us today is that we are talking about cutting spending, rather than adding to it. It is a refreshing change around here.

The looting and burning of Los Angeles predictably has brought about calls for more Government spending.

The cry is heard in the land: "Don't just stand there—spend something!"

But rescissions remind us that spending more is not synonymous with doing more—at least not in government.

The true art of government consists not in how much is spent but in how effective government policy is.

Quality of ideas, not quantity of dollars, is the mark of good government. Let's keep that in mind in the weeks and months ahead.

With a deficit of nearly \$400 billion staring us in the face, spending reductions ought to comprise 90 percent of our deliberations.

Of course, they do not, but the fact that we are considering any reductions at all is a significant breakthrough.

It is a breakthrough due completely to the President's leadership.

Had the President not proposed any rescissions, this legislation before us would never have existed. In fact, the majority seems to have tried to one-up the President by adding an extra amount to his original proposals.

To that I say, great. If we could keep the momentum flowing in this direction, we would not need a balanced budget amendment.

But I know better than to dream on for too long.

In fact, the rule prohibiting amendments designed to expand the reductions contained in the bill, no doubt, reflects the true sentiment on the other side of the aisle. Far be it for the majority to let this process get out of hand.

If the President's rescissions not included in the committee bill were added to it, we would

be saving the taxpayers over \$11 billion. What's wrong with allowing that to be offered? Why are we prohibited from undertaking further reductions on an appropriations bill?

Is the majority afraid that cost-cutting may prove contagious and that we might be hit by an epidemic of frugality? I fear some of us have long since proven to be immune to such a contagion, but you never can tell.

So I am glad we are following the President's lead in cutting excessive spending by nearly \$6 billion. I think it would be good, however, if we went a step further by cutting \$11 billion and really doing ourselves proud.

As they used to say: Try it, you'll like it.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to object to a provision in the appropriations rescissions bill, H.R. 4990, which would rescind 1 percent, \$405 million, of the remaining fiscal year 1992 funds for the Low-Income Heating Assistance Program [LIHEAP].

It is hard to believe that I must speak about the importance of these funds and fight to have them preserved. Aside from having enough to eat, what is more fundamental than having heat in the winter?

This is the second time I have fought for this funding. Last year's Labor/HHS appropriations bill cut LIHEAP funding overall and delayed \$405 million in funding until the final day of fiscal year 1992. However, the bill language urged States to go ahead and obligate the necessary funds under the assumption that the Federal Government would return the money on the final day of fiscal year 1992. Rescinding this \$405 million would result in the elimination of these promised funds and leave the States to make up the difference.

It is now May. It is spring. Here in Washington it may be warm, but in Massachusetts they are still running the heat. Many of the households that received money from LIHEAP to supplement their heating bills this past winter had no other means for paying these bills. Most of them ran out of money for heat long before the LIHEAP season ended last month.

The only reason some of these households received LIHEAP money in the first place was because the States covered the expected Federal dollars. They are expecting payment on September 30, 1992.

This sends a clear message to the States. Which States are going to continue to spend money to cover LIHEAP now that they see the Federal funds being withdrawn? Without adequate funding from the Federal or State Governments, how is LIHEAP going to provide people with heat?

I am a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 282, which expresses the belief that LIHEAP should be funded at a level greater than or equal to the fiscal year 1992 level of \$1.6 billion. It has the bipartisan support of 170 Members which is encouraging.

This country spends a lot of money on a lot of things that are of questionable necessity. But in 1990, 46 percent of the elderly receiving fuel assistance in Massachusetts went an average of 4 days without heat. In fiscal year 1992, 25 percent of the LIHEAP caseload in Massachusetts consisted of first-time applicants.

The situation is bad and it is getting worse. I guarantee that if any person in this Chamber went home for 4 days and had no heat, I

would no longer have to plead for money for LIHEAP.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4990 and in opposition to the amendment that would substitute the President's rescission package. My colleagues on the Appropriations Committee have responded to the deficit pressures we are facing and identified \$5.8 billion to be cut—\$142 million more than proposed by the President.

In the face of \$1.5 trillion budgets, \$400 billion deficits, and nearly \$4 trillion of debt—three-fourths of which has been piled up since 1981—both of these rescission proposals are small change. Either package would only cut the deficit by 1.4 percent and reduce the national debt by an irrelevant 0.002 percent.

Once again, we have a President demanding that Congress upset the balance of powers as laid out in the Constitution by giving him a line-item veto, but when the time comes to actually put some serious spending cuts on the table, the results are far from impressive.

While neither package will solve our deficit problems, the differences between the two packages does illustrate the differences in priorities between Democrats in Congress and the President. Both proposals make roughly 85 percent of their cuts in defense programs, but the Democratic plan cuts \$124 million from foreign aid while the President's plan would only cut domestic programs. In addition, the Democratic plan cuts \$20 million from the House's own funds, but the President's proposal failed to offer any similar cuts in the growing White House budget.

The time has come for both parties to level with the American people about the deficit. The deficit is a tremendous drain on our economy, and there are no easy ways to balance the budget. While we frequently hear campaign pledges that we can balance the budgets simply by cutting waste, without either painful spending cuts or new taxes, these rescission packages only accomplish 1 percent of that tax. Similarly, during the 1990 budget debate, no one was willing and/or able to offer a detailed plan to cut spending by enough to reach the budget summit goal of \$100 billion a year.

After so much rhetoric about cutting waste and so few results, I think the time has come to ask, "Where's the pork?" If no one can or will identify enough waste to reduce the deficit, we must be prepared to refocus the debate on choosing between cutting popular programs or raising unpopular taxes.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee's decision to reinstate funding for the second *Seawolf* submarine.

Few will argue with the need to downsize defense. However, with our future Defense needs unclear, Defense cuts must be carried out with careful precision; not with blind swings of an ax. The *Seawolf* represents the finest submarine technology in the world. Canceling the program after one submarine will deal a critical blow to this country's ability to produce submarines and is unfair to the workers and communities affected.

By ending the program now, we would forfeit the industrial base which has taken years to assemble and threaten the construction of the next class of submarines later this decade.

We cannot afford to dismantle our Defense infrastructure. It has taken decades to assemble such a wealth of skill and knowledge. If this brain trust is allowed to disperse, it will be difficult—if not impossible—to reassemble it. With the spread of submarine technology, including in such troublesome regions as the Persian Gulf, we cannot afford to relinquish our strategic advantage in this area.

Recently, comments from President Bush's own staff have suggested that canceling the *Seawolf* is a mistake. The subcommittee's decision turned the tide in favor of those who believe in the program. We must continue the fight. We must maintain our ability to build the next generation of submarines in the 1990's. Ending the *Seawolf* program prematurely would deal a near-fatal blow to that capability.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4990, rescinding certain budget authority for fiscal year 1992. I commend Chairman WHITTEN and his committee for their prompt action on H.R. 4990 which rescinds \$5,805 million in budget authority, \$118 million more than the President requested. The Congressional Budget Office [CBO] estimated outlay savings of \$1,506 million in fiscal year 1992 and \$1,346 million in fiscal year 1993. These 99 separate rescissions contained in 68 special messages were transmitted to Congress on March 10, March 20, and on April 8. Of this amount, \$2,571 million was included in whole or part in the President's proposals, and \$3,234 million was initiated by the Appropriations Committee.

H.R. 4990 includes \$4.9 billion for Defense—almost the same amount as the President's request but reflecting different priorities. The bill rescinds \$735 million in domestic spending and \$124 million in foreign aid. This bill demonstrates a responsible action by the Appropriations Committee in a timely manner.

According to the General Accounting Office [GAO], the record of Congress in terms of passing rescissions during the Reagan and Bush administrations has been excellent. Congress has passed more rescissions in dollar terms than requested since 1980. I am attaching for the record a comparison of total congressional action on rescissions and total proposed rescissions requested by the President for fiscal years 1981 through 1992.

The total dollar amount of rescissions requested in fiscal years 1981 to 1992—as of February 26, 1992—was \$48.9 billion. The total amount of rescissions enacted in those fiscal years totaled \$49.3 billion.

I urge passage of H.R. 4990.

COMPARISON OF TOTAL CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON RESCISSIONS AND TOTAL PROPOSED RESCISSIONS BY PRESIDENT

Fiscal year	Total dollar amount proposed by President for rescission	Total dollar amount of rescission enacted by Congress	Percentage enacted by Congress
1992 ¹	\$16,700,000	\$1,382,377,000	8,278
1991	4,859,251,000	1,322,955,000	27
1990	554,258,000	2,835,447,000	512
1989	143,100,000	214,366,000	150
1988	0	3,860,533,067
1987	5,835,800,000	5,735,509,675	98
1986	10,126,900,000	6,811,660,000	67
1985	1,854,800,000	5,624,773,000	303
1984	636,400,000	2,236,890,000	351
1983	1,569,000,000	280,605,100	18
1982	7,907,400,000	4,382,413,000	55
1981	15,361,900,000	14,578,526,150	95

COMPARISON OF TOTAL CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON RESCISSIONS AND TOTAL PROPOSED RESCISSIONS BY PRESIDENT—Continued

Fiscal year	Total dollar amount proposed by President for rescission	Total dollar amount of rescission enacted by Congress	Percentage enacted by Congress
Total	48,865,509,000	49,276,174,992	101

¹ As of February 26, 1992.

Source: General Accounting Office.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the proposed rescission of \$7.677 million in funds for the Public Telecommunications Facilities Program [PTFP] for fiscal year 1992.

Administered by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration in the Department of Commerce, PTFP is a competitive matching grant program that supports the construction and maintenance of public television and radio facilities. Since its inception, the program has been extremely successful in extending the reach and quality of public broadcasting to underserved areas. PTFP grants enable applicants, many from rural and minority areas, to construct broadcast facilities to serve the needs and interests of their local communities. Moreover, PTFP has made grants specifically targeted to increasing the participation of minorities and women in public broadcasting. And as part of the House's most recent authorization legislation for public broadcasting, PTFP has been directed to enhance the provision of public telecommunications services to underserved audiences, including deaf and hearing-impaired and blind and visually impaired people.

Not only does PTFP work to extend the reach of public broadcasting, but the grant program also funds initiatives to develop innovative uses of educational telecommunications. In the past, PTFP has supported instructional telecommunications services for educational institutions and nonprofit organizations. And in 1992, PTFP began to solicit proposals for a major telecommunications educational program that would coordinate a wide array of technologies and services to link educational institutions on the local, State, and national level. As it becomes increasingly clear that America's international competitiveness is dependent on improving our educational system, the importance of PTFP's continued commitment to educational initiatives cannot be understated.

Despite the programs' enormous successes, PTFP's work is far from finished—today, fully 14 percent of the Nation is not yet served by public radio and 6 percent live beyond the reach of public television. And in 1991, a lack of available funds meant that some 66 percent of the total dollars requested by applicants were not granted.

Few in this body would dispute that extending the reach of public broadcasting and funding educational telecommunications initiatives are laudable goals. However, Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us today would greatly undermine the ability of PTFP to help realize these important objectives. The proposed \$7.677 million rescission would cut PTFP's funding by one-third, which, according to some estimates, would prevent the funding of 46 projects in fiscal year 1992. Such attempts to

cut PTFP funding are nothing new—throughout the 1980's and 1990's the Reagan and Bush administrations annually have attempted to zero out PTFP funding. Congress repeatedly has rejected these proposals and has demonstrated its steadfast support for public broadcasting by continuing to provide fair funding for this important program. The House again affirmed its commitment to PTFP and public broadcasting last November by passing unanimously H.R. 2977, the Public Telecommunications Act of 1991, which authorized funding for the PTFP at \$42 million for fiscal years 1992, 1993, and 1994.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, I have had a unique opportunity to witness the significant advances in public broadcasting made possible by PTFP funding. I am convinced that PTFP is deserving of its full \$22.9 million appropriation for fiscal year 1992, and that this proposed rescission would be a devastating blow to this important program and to public broadcasting as a whole. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose the PTFP budget rescission.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. The bill reported by the Appropriations Committee would rescind \$5.8 billion in budget authority for fiscal year 1992. The associated outlay reduction will reduce the fiscal year 1992 deficit by \$1.3 billion. With a fiscal year 1992 deficit now projected to be around \$370 billion, every dollar of unnecessary spending that can be eliminated is important. The Appropriations Committee should be commended for their efforts to develop a responsible spending reduction bill.

This bill reduces spending slightly more than requested by the President in his rescission proposals considered by the committee, but even more could be saved. The committee did not consider the \$2.2 billion in defense rescissions transmitted by the President which are not included in this bill, another \$5.4 billion could be saved and the total BA reduction could be nearly doubled to \$11.2 billion.

Despite the apparent good start at spending reduction, let us not feel ourselves into thinking that every dollar rescinded by this bill represents a real reduction in spending. In many instances, the Appropriations Committee has simply recognized reality and rescinded funds that are no longer needed for their intended purpose. There is nothing wrong with doing this, but it is certainly nothing to brag about.

Other reductions, such as the reduction in funds available for delayed obligations in the Labor/HHS appropriation, simply remove spending authority which should never have been provided in the first place. Unfortunately, this bill rescinds only \$18 million of the \$4 billion in delayed obligations contained in the fiscal year 1992 appropriation. The entire amount should be rescinded because there is not enough room under the fiscal year 1993 spending cap to meet both these delayed obligations and legitimate fiscal year 1993 spending needs.

Budgeting necessarily requires hard choices about spending priorities. The fact that we are returning after only a few months to rethink some of the choices made last autumn does not make our job any easier. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill not because it is

good politics, but because it is the responsible thing to do.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for the rescission proposals offered by President Bush. I voted in favor of his proposals because I strongly believe in the importance and necessity of cutting unnecessary spending to reduce the Federal budget deficit, and I wish that the House had approved the President's rescission package.

Once the House rejected the President's proposals, I reluctantly voted in support of the Committee's package. However, due to my serious concern about the cuts in low-income home energy assistance and lowbush blueberry research, I will be working with the conference committee to draft a final version of this legislation that does not include these two ill-advised cuts.

Rather than targeting some of the most wasteful programs, the committee's package makes across-the-board cuts in many important programs. I cannot believe that we are willing to cut low-income energy assistance, financial aid for higher education, and compensatory education in order to save a submarine program that President Bush, Defense Secretary Cheney and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Colin Powell, all believe is unnecessary.

In fact, the Appropriations Committee's proposals turns the so-called peace dividend on its head. According to the committee, we now need to cut low-income fuel assistance and some education programs in order to protect certain components of the defense budget.

The method by which these worthy programs were chosen for rescission while other low-priority projects were left untouched in the House package was irrational. It is obvious that the merits of each program considered for rescission were not analyzed carefully as part of a coherent plan to reduce spending.

Instead, political games were played. The House cut Senate-sponsored programs in its package and the Senate acted similarly. Each party tried to protect its own interests.

My colleagues, I ask you, is this the right way to reduce spending and the Federal deficit? We need to put an end to partisan bickering and politics as usual to protect American taxpayers and to halt the growth of the budget deficit. Only when we are willing to work together will truly meaningful cuts be made in Federal spending.

I was particularly distressed to see that the committee decided to rescind \$4 million for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. With the inclusion of a cut in LIHEAP, Congress has pushed its scalpel past the fat to the vulnerable heart of meaningful Government programs.

The confusion generated by the committee's decision becomes more profound as one takes a short step back to examine recent LIHEAP funding history. As the House debated fiscal year 1992 funding for LIHEAP last year, it was pointed out that less than 25 percent of eligible households were served by the program. For those few receiving benefits, the Government payment amounted to less than 25 percent of the recipients' home energy bills. The majority of the people who received LIHEAP funds during fiscal year 1991 were families with incomes under \$6,000 per year.

Against this backdrop of sheer need, the Congress agreed last year to cut the amount of funds available to poor families in the winter of fiscal year 1992 by approximately \$500 million.

As if this cut wasn't enough, the President, in his latest budget, proposed delaying nearly \$800 million of a total \$1 billion LIHEAP allocation until the last day of the fiscal year, meaning that less than \$300 million would be available next winter, when, of course, people need heating assistance.

My colleagues, look at the numbers over the past 3 fiscal years—\$1.6 billion, \$1.1 billion, and if the President's budget holds, \$300 million.

Now, it appears that some in this body would like to whittle an extra \$4 million off the spare block of funding currently held in reserve for fiscal year 1992 until the last day of the fiscal year. It might appear that since these funds were not available this past winter, they have no real utility. On the contrary, they have been spent already. Oil dealers and utilities in Maine have extended credit to their poorer customers to help them get through the winter, in anticipation of upcoming LIHEAP payments. Being businesses, they need to cover their costs, however, and now they are looking for the money owed to them. The community action agencies which disburse LIHEAP payments on the local level receive frantic phone calls from LIHEAP recipients whose bills are now due. The State of Maine, in response to the urgent demand, is trying to take out a loan backed by the held-over reserve to meet payments already incurred throughout the winter. Because the State will have to pay interest on the loan, the poor citizens of Maine will receive less actual heating assistance for the money allotted them by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, this body has once again entered the theater of the absurd. We are voting to cut a program for the desperately poor and for which demand has increased greatly during the rescission, but for which funding has steadily decreased over the past 2 years. We are voting to cut money that in many cases has already been spent. While I am pleased with most of the committee's choices on the rescission list, I am dumfounded by the inclusion of LIHEAP. LIHEAP isn't pork. It's not water subsidies to big farmers, or tobacco subsidies, or someone's favorite road project, or some other unauthorized budgetary goodie. LIHEAP helps to keep old, the young, and the destitute warm in winter, and when this body takes up legislation on LIHEAP in the Labor-HHS appropriations bill later this year, it must be strengthened.

By voting for both packages, I have been forced to make tough choices. Less than \$200,000 in fiscal year 1992 appropriations for lowbush blueberry research has been proposed for rescission in both the President's and the committee's package. I fully believe that this program is deserving of the funds which it had been appropriated.

When proposing this project for rescission, the administration asserted that "This project on weed, insect and disease control, and remote sensing management of lowbush blueberries was not peer-reviewed or competitively awarded. It is not nationally significant, and di-

rect beneficiaries were not required to contribute to the funding." Simply put: These claims are not true.

Before funding was requested, the proposed research was reviewed by many experts, specifically an interdisciplinary research council at the University of Maine and an industry advisory committee established by Maine law. These groups ensured that only the most needed studies were included in the research funded by these moneys.

Because the lowbush, or wild, blueberry is unique from other species, research done on blueberries in other parts of the country is not transferable to wild blueberries. While Maine produces 98 percent of wild blueberries in the United States, these berries represent 50 percent of the total North American crop, thus representing a significant portion of this Nation's supply.

In addition, the direct beneficiary of this funding, namely the wild blueberry industry, does contribute funding to the research. For fiscal year 1992, the industry will contribute \$111,300 in funding, and in a measure of State support, the University of Maine will contribute approximately \$300,000.

Furthermore, this program is a good investment for the Government. It aids an industry that is constantly growing and providing more jobs for an area which has had longstanding economic difficulties. The industry has grown from a \$24 million industry in 1980 to a \$86 million industry in 1990.

This growth is directly correlated to the research done at the Maine Agricultural Experiment Station. Additionally, it is clear from these facts that this research is peer-reviewed, nationally as well as regionally significant, and is supported financially by the beneficiaries. For these reasons, its funding should not be rescinded.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I will be supporting H.R. 4990, the appropriations rescission bill as passed by the House Appropriations Committee but I do so deeply regretting the committee's recommendation to rescind 1 percent of the remaining fiscal year 1992 funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP]. I understand that in these difficult times all programs must share equally in the budget cutbacks. But I also believe that the LIHEAP Program has already taken its share of cuts and to further reduce this funding would permanently weaken our ability to provide this necessary service.

Last year's Labor-HHS appropriations bill cut LIHEAP funding overall and delayed \$405 million in funding until the final day of this fiscal year. The report to accompany that bill urged States to, in effect, make up this shortfall by obligating both the regular and the delayed funding. Many States did just that so as not to leave families without heat during that critical time. These States made this decision with the understanding that this funding would be available at the end of the year.

The proposed LIHEAP rescission we will be voting on today will leave these States holding the bag. Those States who borrowed money from other State accounts to make up the LIHEAP shortfall will be unable to repay those funds. And we will be unable to convince any State to once again make advance funding available for this critical program.

President Bush's proposal would continue this dangerous cycle by asking us to hold \$800 million in LIHEAP funds until the last day of fiscal year 1993. That may make us feel better by making our budget numbers look better, but such a plan would just set a trap for next year.

I will not object to the Appropriations Committee LIHEAP proposal as part of this overall bill. However, I will strongly encourage my colleagues from the House to agree in conference with the Senate LIHEAP recommendation. And I will also urge for full funding for fiscal year 1993 with no delay in funding.

LIHEAP has proven successful in helping low-income and elderly citizens afford energy and energy savings improvements in their homes. It is one of the only grants available to the working poor and recently unemployed families.

To the estimated 25,000 families LIHEAP serves in Rhode Island, this program is a badly needed safety net that provides them with financial assistance in paying their utility bills.

The lack of adequate funding for LIHEAP affects all consumers. With the mandated moratorium in effect on utility service terminations during the winter months, these consumers continue to receive gas service at least through the winter. If consumers are unable to meet their bills, the cost of providing gas service is continued part of a utility's cost of service and that burden is then shared by all customers of that utility.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in demanding restoration of LIHEAP funding. This program is far too important for this type of smoke-and-mirror budget games.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment printed in part 1 of House Report 102-514 is considered as having been adopted.

The text of H.R. 4990 as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 4990

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following rescissions of budget authority are made, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, \$100,000 are rescinded for cattail management in North Dakota.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, \$531,000 are re-

scinded for special research grants, as follows:

Integrated orchard management, \$49,000;
Leafy spurge biocontrol, \$125,000;
Lowbush blueberry research, \$185,000;
Mink feeding and reproduction research, \$46,000;
Seedless table grapes, \$50,000; and
Urban pest research, \$76,000.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, \$1,125,000 are rescinded for Buildings and Facilities, Cooperative State Research Service, as follows:

Animal care facility, \$250,000;
Building consolidation, \$500,000; and
Food processing plant, \$375,000.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, \$462,000 are rescinded. Such funds were made available for a grant for agricultural law research and information at the Leflar School of Law.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, \$10,031,000 are rescinded. Such funds were made available for ADP related activities.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES, PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-140, \$7,677,000 are rescinded.

RELATED AGENCIES

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

ISRAEL RELAY STATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101-162, \$13,748,000 are rescinded.

TITLE III

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following program in the specified amount:

General Defense Intelligence Program, \$432,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

General Defense Intelligence Program, \$5,370,000;

Consolidated Cryptologic Program, \$6,900,000;

Fort Riley Railroad Study, \$6,800,000;

Airborne and Special Operations Museum, \$4,000,000;
National D-Day Museum, \$4,000,000; and
Manhattan, Kansas Airport Study, \$250,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

General Defense Intelligence Program, \$8,361,000;
Consolidated Cryptologic Program, \$8,300,000;
Naval Undersea Museum, \$1,750,000;
U.S.S. Blueback Museum, \$1,600,000; and
Greenbank Naval Observatory, \$900,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

General Defense Intelligence Program, \$30,946,000; and
Consolidated Cryptologic Program, \$6,400,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE AGENCIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

General Defense Intelligence Program, \$14,970,000;

Consolidated Cryptologic Program, \$3,000,000;

Coordinator for Drug Enforcement Policy and Support, \$1,000,000;

Coordinated Care Implementation, \$50,000,000;

Charleston Harbor Management Plan, \$500,000; and

Legacy Resource Management Program, \$15,000,000.

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amount:

Miscellaneous unobligated balances, \$22,000,000.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101-511, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

Miscellaneous unobligated balances, \$7,270,000; and

MPLH deployment kits, \$13,100,000.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101-165, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amount:

Miscellaneous unobligated balances, \$21,800,000.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amount:

Miscellaneous unobligated balances, \$23,500,000.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following

funds are hereby rescinded from the following program in the specified amount:

Bradley Fighting Vehicle (advance procurement), \$50,000,000.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-28, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following program in the specified amount:

25mm M919, \$23,300,000.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

HMX, \$1,000,000; and

ET fuze M762, \$22,000,000.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

National Training Center Support, \$5,900,000; and

General Defense Intelligence Program, \$1,000,000.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101-165, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following program in the specified amount:

PSYOP Equipment (SOF), \$1,300,000.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

E-2C advance procurement, \$39,000,000; and

T-45 program, \$40,000,000.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

Personal defense weapon, \$11,638,000; and

Allegheny Ballistics Lab, \$13,200,000.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101-511, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following program in the specified amount:

SSN-21 advance procurement, \$179,400,000.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

SSN-21 advance procurement, \$375,500,000; and

SSN-21, \$1,314,700,000.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

SSN-21, \$189,400,000;

SURTASS, \$4,000,000;

AN/SLQ-32(V), \$1,300,000;

AN/SQR-18, \$5,000,000; and

Intelligence Support Equipment, \$2,453,000.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following program in the specified amount:

155mm ADAM, \$40,200,000.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101-511, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

AAVT1 product improvement, \$6,500,000;

Telecommunications equipment, \$5,500,000; and

Amphibious fuel system, \$2,500,000.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following program in the specified amount:

VC-137 Replacement aircraft, \$7,012,000.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101-165, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following program in the specified amount:

AC-130U Gunship (SOF), \$9,000,000.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

Peacekeeper (M-X), \$73,000,000;

Advanced Cruise Missile, \$130,000,000;

Advanced Cruise Missile modifications, \$12,000,000; and

Spares and Repair Parts, ACM, \$22,642,000.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101-165, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following program in the specified amount:

SRAM II, \$6,415,000.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

Selected Activities, \$140,100,000; and

Intelligence Production Activity, \$2,124,000.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101-165, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following program in the specified amount:

Miscellaneous Equipment (SOF), \$1,100,000.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE AGENCIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following program in the specified amount:

Classified Equipment, \$13,900,000.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

Medium Tactical Vehicles (Cab over HMMWV), \$2,500,000;

Light Armed Scout Helicopter, \$11,500,000;

Advanced Tank Cannon (ATAC), \$6,000,000;

Tractor Jewel, \$60,000,000;

Tractor Pull, \$16,000,000;

Tractor Helm, \$68,300,000;

Neuroscience Center, \$10,000,000; and

Forward Area Air Defense (FAAD), \$51,000,000.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101-511, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

Anti-Satellite Weapon (ASAT), \$10,000,000;
 Combat Vehicle Improvement Program,
 \$5,000,000;
 Other Missile Product Improvement Program,
 \$1,000,000; and
 Fiber Optic Guided Missile (FOG-M),
 \$10,000,000.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND
 EVALUATION, NAVY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

Centurion Submarine, \$23,000,000;
 Advanced Nuclear Reactor Component Systems, \$18,000,000;
 Trident II, \$23,000,000;
 EMPRESS II Testing, \$10,000,000;
 MK-30 Target, \$10,000,000;
 Advanced Submarine Systems, \$10,000,000;
 Retractable Elm, \$50,000,000;
 Aegis Combat System Engineering, \$10,000,000;
 Submarine Sonar Development, \$2,000,000;
 Submarine Support Equipment, \$10,000,000;
 Anti-Air Warfare/Anti-Submarine Warfare Technology, \$1,400,000;
 Ship Towed Array, \$6,100,000;
 Industrial Preparedness (Acquisition Workforce Training), \$5,000,000;
 Industrial Preparedness (Metal Spray Forming), \$9,000,000;
 Industrial Preparedness (Submarine Propulsors), \$3,000,000;
 Joint Advanced Systems, \$140,000,000; and
 Tactical Reconnaissance and Surveillance, \$3,656,000.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101-511, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

Ship Development, \$1,000,000;
 Mine Countermeasures, \$4,000,000;
 Support Equipment, \$6,000,000;
 P-3, \$20,000,000;
 A-12, \$20,000,000;
 Consolidated Electronic Warfare, \$4,000,000;
 Ship Subsystem Development, \$1,000,000;
 Mine Countermeasures, \$5,000,000;
 Fixed Distributed System, \$5,000,000; and
 Target Systems Development, \$3,000,000.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND
 EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

Advanced Tactical Fighter, \$50,000,000;
 Advanced Strategic Missile System, \$10,000,000;
 Special Projects, \$157,000,000;
 B-52 Squadrons, \$3,000,000;
 Night Precision Attack, \$20,000,000;
 Forest Green, \$2,400,000;
 Marywood College, \$10,000,000;
 Special Activities, \$235,000,000; and
 Range Improvements (Poker Flats), \$10,000,000.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101-511, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

Advanced Cruise Missile, \$2,000,000;
 SRAM II—Engineering Development, \$4,000,000;
 SRAM-T, \$2,000,000; and
 Special Activities, \$16,000,000.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND
 EVALUATION, DEFENSE AGENCIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

CV-22, \$9,900,000;
 Defense Nuclear Agency, \$30,000,000;
 U.S. Japan Management Training, \$9,700,000;
 Non-AASERT Scientist and Engineer Training, \$15,000,000;
 Strategic Environmental R&D, \$50,000,000;
 AIM-9 Consolidated Program, \$40,000,000;
 Non-Acoustic ASW, \$10,000,000;
 Manufacturing Technology, \$100,000,000;
 OSD Support, \$20,000,000;
 NATO R&D, \$28,000,000;
 Cryptologic Activities, \$5,700,000;
 Selected Activities, \$19,700,000;
 Joint Simulation, \$20,000,000;
 Manufacturing Managers in the Classroom, \$5,000,000;
 Kansas State University, \$7,700,000;
 University of Wisconsin, \$1,600,000;
 Boston University, \$29,000,000;
 Medical College of Ohio, \$250,000;
 University of South Carolina, \$500,000;
 New Mexico State University, \$3,000,000;
 University of Texas at Austin, \$6,000,000;
 Northeastern University, \$6,000,000;
 Texas Regional Institute for Environmental Studies, \$5,000,000;
 George Mason University, \$750,000;
 Monmouth College, \$2,300,000;
 University of Minnesota, \$10,000,000;
 University of Saint Thomas, \$500,000;
 Brandeis University, \$2,000,000;
 Oregon Graduate Institute, \$1,300,000; and
 Institute for Advanced Science and Technology, \$10,000,000.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101-511, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following programs in the specified amounts:

Critical Technologies Institute, \$4,900,000;
 Manufacturing Technology, \$3,000,000;
 Strategic Environmental R&D, \$69,000,000;
 Balanced Technology Initiative, \$5,000,000;
 Joint Standoff Weapons, \$5,000,000; and
 Management Headquarters, \$1,000,000.

DEFENSE BUSINESS OPERATIONS FUND

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following program in the specified amount:

Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund, \$82,900,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY STAFF

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following program in the specified amount:

Intelligence Community Staff, \$5,000,000.

TITLE IV

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-104, \$500,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-104, \$3,350,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That the amount for project 92-G-302, Fermilab main injector, is reduced to \$11,650,000.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-104, \$500,000 are rescinded.

TITLE V

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT
 FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS
 MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading by Public Law 101-513, \$32,500,000 are rescinded.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTER-AMERICAN

DEVELOPMENT BANK

INTER-AMERICAN INVESTMENT CORPORATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available by Public Law 102-145 as amended for the Inter-American Investment Corporation, \$2,000,000 are rescinded.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading by Public Law 101-513, \$100,000 are rescinded.

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

DEOBLIGATION/REOBLIGATION AUTHORITY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available by Public Law 102-145 as amended, and by prior Acts providing funding for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for fiscal years prior to fiscal year 1992, under the following headings: "Agriculture, rural development, and nutrition, Development Assistance", "Private sector, environment, and energy, Development Assistance", "Sub-Saharan Africa, Development Assistance" and "Economic Support Fund", \$6,320,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That this rescission shall be made from funds deobligated but continued available by sections 515 or 517 of any such Act (or by any other provision of such Act providing "deobligation/reobligation authority" or "availability of funds"): *Provided further*, That the same proportion of the unobligated balance of the funds continued available for each such heading pursuant to this paragraph shall be rescinded.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available by Public Law 102-145 as amended for "Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development", \$40,975 are rescinded.

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available by Public Law 102-145 as amended for the Economic Support Fund which are not earmarked, \$1,100,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND
TRAINING
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available by Public Law 102-145 as amended for "International Military Education and Training", \$1,905,000 are rescinded.

FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM
(RESCISSION)

Of the grant funds made available by Public Law 102-145 as amended for the "Foreign Military Financing Program", \$56,100,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available by Public Law 102-145 as amended for the "Foreign Military Financing Program" shall be obligated or expended for Peru: *Provided further*, That no earmarked funds shall be rescinded except that up to \$5,100,000 of the funds made available by Public Law 102-145 as amended by and earmarked only for Turkey through the provisions of Public Law 101-513 shall be available for rescission under this heading.

DEOBLIGATION/REOBLIGATION AUTHORITY

Notwithstanding section 515(b) of Public Law 101-513, and the corresponding authority provided in Public Law 102-145 as amended, no Foreign Military Financing Program funds may be reobligated pursuant to such authority from the date of enactment of this Act through September 30, 1992.

SPECIAL DEFENSE ACQUISITION FUND
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

Notwithstanding any provision of Public Law 102-145 as amended, Public Law 101-513 or Public Law 101-167, not to exceed \$235,000,000 may be obligated pursuant to section 51(c)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act during fiscal year 1992.

TITLE VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND
RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-154, \$987,000 for the Calumet Historic District, MI, are rescinded.

CONSTRUCTION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-154, \$11,365,000 are rescinded, of which \$375,000 was made available for the Calumet Historic District, MI; and of which \$1,540,000 was made available for the Lewis and Clark Trail Center, NE; and of which \$1,750,000 was made available for the Council Bluffs National Trail Center, IA; and of which \$7,700,000 was made available for historic restoration projects in Perth Amboy, Trenton, and Paterson, New Jersey.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 99-190, \$7,705,000 for the engineering and construction of the Burr Trail National Rural Scenic Road are rescinded.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

CONSTRUCTION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-154, \$8,593,000 for road sealing are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-154, \$144,000 for the Office of the Federal Inspector for the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System are rescinded.

TITLE VII

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, AND
RELATED AGENCIESGENERAL PROVISION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available in Public Law 102-170 which do not become available for obligation until September 30, 1992, one percentum are hereby rescinded from each applicable appropriation account: *Provided*, That no reduction shall be made under the heading "Payments to States for Child Care Assistance".

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN
SERVICESPUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available in Public Law 102-170 for personnel compensation and personnel benefits for the Public Health Service, \$7,000,000 are rescinded.

TITLE VIII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVESSALARIES AND EXPENSES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading, \$20,000,000 are rescinded, as follows:

OFFICIAL MAIL COSTS

The funds available under this heading shall be reduced by \$20,000,000.

TITLE IX

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY
CONSTRUCTION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds provided in Military Construction Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts in the specified amounts:

Military Construction, Navy, 1988/1992, \$5,100,000;

Military Construction, Army National Guard, 1988/1992, \$1,709,000;

Military Construction, Air Force, 1990/1994, \$6,170,000;

Military Construction, Defense Agencies, 1990/1994, \$10,000,000;

Military Construction, Army National Guard, 1990/1994, \$2,552,000;

Military Construction, Army Reserve, 1990/1994, \$649,000;

Military Construction, Army, 1991/1995, \$9,000,000;

Military Construction, Air Force, 1991/1995, \$6,300,000;

Military Construction, Defense Agencies, 1991/1995, \$22,100,000;

Military Construction, Army Reserve, 1991/1995, \$2,100,000;

Military Construction, Army, 1992/1996, \$8,850,000;

Military Construction, Navy, 1992/1996, \$5,400,000;

Military Construction, Air Force, 1992/1996, \$5,500,000;

Military Construction, Defense Agencies, 1992/1996, \$24,000,000;

Military Construction, Army National Guard, 1992/1996, \$600,000;

Military Construction, Air National Guard, 1992/1996, \$306,000;

Military Construction, Naval Reserve, 1992/1996, \$10,900,000; and

North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure, 1992/1996, \$14,834,000.

TITLE X

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
AND RELATED AGENCIESDEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATIONBRIDGES ON DAMS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 95-599, \$5,000,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION
LOCAL RAIL FREIGHT ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-143, \$5,000,000 are rescinded.

TITLE XI

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIESDEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING PROGRAMS

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND OPPORTUNITY FOR
PEOPLE EVERYWHERE GRANTS (HOPE GRANTS)
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, \$14,400,000 are rescinded, of which \$6,600,000 is to be derived from funds made available for the HOPE for Public and Indian Housing Homeownership Program; \$3,900,000 is to be derived from funds made available for the HOPE for Homeownership of Multifamily Units Program; and \$3,900,000 is to be derived from funds made available for the HOPE for Homeownership of Single Family Homes Program.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, \$61,500,000 are rescinded.

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139 and prior years, \$509,400,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That the amounts earmarked under such headings for expenditure (not including amounts transferred to another account), and other amounts under such heading for fiscal year 1992, shall all be reduced proportionally.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, \$11,700,000 are rescinded.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, \$24,000,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE
ADMINISTRATIONRESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, \$4,000,000 are rescinded.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. No amendments to the bill are in order except the amendments printed in part 2 of House Report 102-514. Said amendments shall be considered in the order and manner specified, shall be considered as having been read and shall not be subject to amendment. Debate time for each amendment shall be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

If both amendments printed in part 2 of House Report 102-514 are adopted, only the latter amendment adopted shall be considered as finally adopted and reported back to the House.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 102-514.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
OFFERED BY MR. FAWELL

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. FAWELL: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF RESCISSIONS
PROPOSED BY PRESIDENT

The budgetary resources specified in the following rescission proposals, transmitted to the Congress by the President pursuant to the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, are hereby rescinded:

(1) Rescission proposals R92-2 through R92-7, R92-9 through R92-16, and R92-18 through R92-33, transmitted on March 10, 1992.

(2) Rescission proposals R92-35 through R92-102, transmitted on March 20, 1992.

(3) Rescission proposal R92-34, transmitted on April 8, 1992.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, obviously, I rise for the purpose of supporting the substitute amendment, which basically constitutes the Presidential rescissions which were submitted on March 10 and on March 20 coming to a total of slightly under \$5.8 billion. That is to say, slightly less than what the Appropriations Committee submitted in their rescissions.

I do so with a great deal of frustration, not because I do not support the Presidential rescission requests. I most emphatically do support them. I would not say that I necessarily am wild about every one of them, but I certainly am wild about having the President have the right to be able to participate in the appropriations process which is guaranteed to him under the

1974 budgetary act. The only thing we gave to the executive branch was the right to submit a line-item rescission. That is all. It is a wet noodle, really, because if Congress does not do anything in 45 days, guess who loses? The President.

But he has one power there. He does have the right after 25 days have gone by, and 25 days have not gone by since the Presidential rescission bills were filed, but if he waits out the 25 days, the Members who have cosponsored—and I am the chief sponsor of the Presidential rescission bills—have a right to demand that there be a message-by-message vote. At this time there are 96 messages pending, and we can get that debate with only one-fifth of the Members supporting it.

That is the one and only power the President of the United States, representing all of this country, has; whereas we, of course, Members, represent various districts. And it is a very important right. Admittedly, I would say that the President has not seriously, no President has since 1974 seriously used that power. But President Bush is seriously using it because I think he is as frustrated as all of us are frustrated about the debt and the deficit—23 years in a row we have not balanced a budget—\$300 billion just on the interest alone; half a trillion dollars of brand new debt this year.

□ 1410

That is why people like Senator RUDMAN and others are just giving up and going home. They are saying you cannot get there from here. Well, we are trying to get there from here in a very little way, and I laud, as I have said, the Committee on Appropriations for not taking the attitude that some in the other body have taken to fill their particular rescissions with veto bait so that we can be assured that we do not get anything at all.

We have a good start. But the Committee on Rules has killed the Presidential rescissions as a practical matter. They theoretically have not killed the April 9 rescissions which are another \$2.2 billion, mostly defense rescissions, but they have killed the March 10, the March 20, and the April 8 ones, which mean the President no longer even has a right to come Monday, when I believe the 25 days have gone by; lo and behold, the Committee on Appropriations beat us to the punch. They not only beat us to the punch, they went to the Committee on Rules, and then the Committee on Rules did what I believe is an unbelievably dumb thing. They just said to the bipartisan group that in all sincerity presented to the Committee on Rules the possibility of also having an amendment which could be considered complementary to what the Committee on Appropriations had already done, to add to the \$5.8 billion, \$6.6 billion more.

We got that by simply determining, after deducting the \$2.6 billion from the Presidential rescissions which were not in, and we were able to come up with \$7.9 billion. We took away the \$2.6 billion, and then we added another \$1.3 billion in pork buster rescissions, which really refers to bills that never really saw the light of day and went through the appropriations process, and we said, "Here is \$6.6 billion. You do not have to adopt them."

We did not get a project-by-project vote, because you have outmaneuvered us, because we had to wait that 25-day period. But, OK, package it all up, put them all together the good and the bad, but at least give us the opportunity when we consider the rescissions that the Committee on Appropriations is considering to also consider these. No; we did not say you had to even vote for it, just give us the chance to argue it, and we were denied that right.

Therefore, when I say that I am frustrated as I come here, I am frustrated because it is academic. If the people out in that listening land in America think that the President has any opportunity today to win, they are mistaken. We have got a Sophie's choice, and as a practical matter with the king-of-the-hill arrangement, which means that the last amendment to be presented which will be the Committee on Appropriations amendment, that is the one that prevails. In other words, if the President, or if we, have a majority of the people here go with the President, he still loses, because under the so-called king-of-the-hill arrangement, the last bill to be presented, which will be the Appropriations bill, if it gets a majority, and undoubtedly it will, even if the President's bill gets a majority, too, the President loses. It is what I call the Sophie's choice.

We have got twin rescissions here, both of them meritorious, and what we are forced to do is to make a decision between the two. We cannot have both. So no matter what we do it has been decreed that there will only be a \$5.8 billion cut in spending. No more than that will be allowed. It is decreed by the Committee on Rules, and that is the frustration about standing up here and talking about the fact that one ought to support the President's rescission.

In fact, everybody on the other side of the aisle, you might as well, if it does not affect your district, because you know very well that the President's rescission bill cannot make it out of this House. The cards are stacked. The dice are loaded. There is no chance whatsoever that it can be done.

But I am here anyway, because I believe what the President is doing is meritorious. He is exercising the rights that this Congress gave to him back in 1974 when, in effect, they took the impoundment power away from an in-

jured President Nixon, who was in no condition to try to ward that off.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] in the statements that he has made not only before the Committee today but also before the Committee on Rules. The gentleman before the Committee on Rules and also today has been extremely fair in his statements concerning our committee, and I want you to know that we appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, we tried to do it right. We tried to do it right on our committee. Every one of the subcommittee chairmen who had the rescission before their subcommittees have tried to do it right and to bring out a good bill.

The gentleman from Illinois has, as the rule provided, the right to offer the President's proposals, 99 rescission requests. We approved 66 of those requests. The President's request, as has been pointed out in general debate this morning, was \$5 billion, 662 million. The bill that we have before the committee is for \$5 billion, \$804 million. We ask the committee to rescind \$141 million more than the President requested.

This, as I pointed out a few minutes ago, Mr. Chairman, is the best rescission bill that the Committee on Appropriations has presented since the Budget Act was passed in 1974.

Again, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois. He has been extremely fair.

Our bill is better than the President's bill, and we recommend this to the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1420

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to one of the points that the chairman has been making. I think it is a point with which all of us are concerned.

Obviously, there is a better way to go about cutting spending than through the rescissions that have been submitted, but that is the whole point here. The process has not worked very well, and I do not think there is anyone in the Chamber who would dispute the fact that the Congress could be saving money. We could be spending less money than we are, and the taxpayers of this country would be better off if we took that position; but political pressures and differing views of what is advisable cause this Congress to spend more money as a group than we need to be spending, and more than any one of us individually can really support.

So when the President says, "I will take the responsibility on my shoulders

to send you a list of things I know individually are all popular with somebody," we ought to vote on these things as items. It is something to which the Congress needs to respond.

I supported a rule which would have enabled us to debate these items one by one to try to make individual determinations whether the programs were advisable or not. There are programs in the President's rescission list that I believe we should go forward with.

As a matter of fact, there are a couple that are of particular interest to me, and if I had my choice I would support some of these programs. The Impact Aid Program which is on the committee's list, is one of the most important, and I do not like to see reductions in that particular program; but because of the rule that was adopted by the majority we do not have the luxury of voting on each, as some of my colleagues here suggest. As a result, we have to take this blunt instrument approach, which either affirms or rejects the entire list.

By and large, the list submitted by the President is a very sound list of savings. We might all have objections to individual items, as I have indicated. However, particularly with respect to the military items, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I can attest to my colleagues that, by and large, these are items that the administration did not request. In tough times we need to make priority decisions and these are items that could be eliminated.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the President's rescission request and vote aye.

Mr. Chairman, it is a rare day in this Chamber when we have the opportunity to consider real cuts in Federal spending. But, fortunately for the American taxpayers, that is what the House is belatedly and finally doing today.

Over the last 5 years, Congress has approved only 0.0165 percent of all rescissions submitted by the President. But, the package before us today, I believe, which will save almost \$6 billion, is the largest package of rescissions, or spending cuts, since 1974.

Of course, the House hasn't totally abandoned business as usual, despite the step forward. It is regrettable that the rule under which we are debating these spending cuts—a rule which I voted against—does not require House Members to cast recorded votes on each of the proposals—just up-or-down votes on the President's package versus the Appropriations Committee's package—or, more importantly, to add at least the 1.3 billion dollars worth of additional cuts identified by the bipartisan port busters group. That would have been even more of a victory for the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the President's rescissions package which is being offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL]. It will end such wasteful spending as \$120,000 for a study on the disposal of animal manure, \$200,000 on Vidalia onion storage, \$1.5 million on a theater in New York City, and another \$1 million on a parking garage in Kentucky. These projects would not be killed by the committee's alternative.

There are bigger ticket items as well. For example, the President has proposed eliminating two Seawolf submarines to save nearly \$3 billion. The President says the Seawolf is no longer needed as because of the changes in the external threat to our national security.

You would think that, since Members of this body come to the well time after time to call for cuts in the Defense budget, they would take every cut the President proposes in the defense budget and add some more.

But, when push comes to shove, it always seems to be the military muscle that ends up being cut so that the military pork can be preserved. The committee alternative cuts just one Seawolf.

Now, I am not saying that there are no good ideas in the committee alternative. There are a number of good ideas, to be sure, and I wish we had the opportunity to add those to the President's package, rather than simply having to choose between the two. We don't have that opportunity today.

I would also point out that I don't think everything in these two packages deserves to be there. The committee, for example, proposes to cut impact aid. The President does not. And on that, I think the President is right.

Impact aid is essential to school districts serving Native American youth, and the need for it, I can attest, is great and growing. We're not talking luxuries. We're talking basics, about replacing condemned and decaying buildings with safe and decent schools and improving the quality of education in the most economically hard-pressed communities in the Nation.

Both the President's package and the committee alternative would also rescind \$40 million for the Navy's T-45 alternative engine program. This is despite the fact that a Navy study and analysis resulted in a recommendation to proceed with the T-45 program, and more importantly, that the program could offer \$170 million in life-time savings if it were to proceed.

The Apache C model modernization program, too, ought not to be included on the rescission list, in my view. The Army has incurred a \$15 billion to \$20 billion investment in the AH-64 Apache program and has a requirement to keep the aircraft as a fresh and viable front-line attack helicopter system. The Longbow radar system to be installed under the Apache modernization program will multiply the combat effectiveness of the Apache.

Unfortunately, though, the only way to get the nearly \$6 billion worth of savings in either package is to vote for the two packages in their entirety, and then try to come back and restore funds for the high-priority and justifiable programs later.

Had we been allowed the opportunity to make those adjustments today, we could preclude any disruption and increased costs associated with the delay that some of these rescissions may otherwise cause.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation will by no means solve our Nation's deficit program, but it does represent a significant first step in the direction of more responsible spending. I urge the adoption of the President's package.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to join the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] in commending the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] for submitting this amendment. It gives us an opportunity to see whether or not Members really want to support the President's package of rescissions. If you support the President's package of rescissions, you will vote "yes" on Mr. FAWELL's amendment. You will be voting at that point, for example, for all the reductions in public radio and television facilities grants, which the President proposed. The Appropriations Committee included about one-third of the proposal. The President requested a rescission of all of the funds appropriated for these grants for fiscal year 1992.

I understand that the basis for the President's rescission requests was, "Were these items in the fiscal year 1992 budget request a year ago?" Today we are looking at the midpoint of fiscal year 1992 and saying we can make some midterm corrections, but we should not go back to the budget of a year ago and use that as a basis for rescissions.

If you vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL], then you are voting also, for example, to eliminate the increases that were provided for fiscal year 1992 for nurses training, for health professions, for family and internal medicine, and for public health. Those are the kinds of reductions that you will be voting for if you vote for his amendment.

I think the gentleman has provided a service in giving us an opportunity here today to see whether or not you really support the President's package of rescissions.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that if, in fact, your whole decision about which amendment will command your vote, the Fawell amendment or the committee amendment, is a matter of parochial politics, you are going to find plenty of reasons to go one way or the other.

Let me shift the focus a little bit. What we see played out on the floor today and what we saw played out in the Rules Committee yesterday was an epilogue to the greatest power grab in fiscal policy in the history of this country. In 1974, when Congress passed the Budget Act of 1974, they dealt the President out of the process of determining what would be the command of the public's money in the expenditures of Congress and of this Government. The President has tried to project himself back into the process with the most meager prerogatives left to him under the Budget Act. To the extent

that he has been able to do so, the Rules Committee has pre-empted that with this ingenious rule that takes away the little bit of rights the President has.

Now, the upshot of this Budget Act of 1974 was to give prerogatives and privileges to Congress and leave the President with accountability. Every parent in America knows when you separate accountability from prerogatives and privilege, you get a perfect formula for irresponsibility, and it is the irresponsibility that has been played out by Congress as they unilaterally commanded the expenditures of taxpayers' dollars since 1974 that has prompted the American people to vote and demand a line item veto.

Today they are seeing how far Congress will go to preserve its power and leave the President out of the equation. If, in fact, you believe the President should be a full participating partner, you ought to vote for his amendment today and signal that to the Congress.

Should we vote down the President's modified rescission package, I say modified by the Rules Committee as they left part of its rescissions out, if you do not want to vote for that today, if we do not pass that today, then I think the President of the United States ought to veto every appropriations bill in its entirety until at least this Congress is willing to live up to the law they wrote in 1974 and honor that only meager participation left to the President as they grabbed that power in 1974.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, the Budget and Impoundment Reform Act of 1974 has inspired for me Arme's axiom, which is that any time Congress passes a law with the word reform in the title, you should ask yourselves what is being taken away from the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I say vote "yes" on this Presidential rescission. Vote "yes" for some balance of power and authority as our Founding Fathers intended.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this amendment. I will vote, if we have a vote, for the base bill.

But I wanted to rise because the previous speaker indicated that this is being exercised unilaterally. He then, however, did go on to say the Constitution of the United States gives to the President extraordinary powers.

As a matter of fact, the President of the United States and this one in particular has the authority of approximately two-thirds of the Members of this House. That is to say that not one nickel, not one nickel, can be spent in America without the President's signature.

Why do I say that? Because he has had 27 vetoes in a row. We have failed to override any of those vetoes. So, effectively, the President of the United States has a two-thirds vote in this body.

Therefore, it is absolutely incorrect to say that this is any kind of a unilateral process. As a matter of fact, it is a process in which the President of the United States has extraordinary authority.

He has now sent down a rescission pursuant to the Budget Act and the Congress is working its will. It is making decisions. It has in fact agreed with the President on about half, just a little short of half of what he proposed.

It has, on the other hand, said that we believe there are alternatives to his proposals which are more appropriate. That is the appropriate legislative process. That is the process the Founding Fathers envisioned in creating two coequal branches of Government, not a branch of Government that might be in the position of saying, well, if the President tells us to do it, then we must do it.

As a matter of fact, that is what the Revolutionary War was all about. We did away with kings. We have a democracy. It is working.

I suggest that we have made our judgments and ought to reject this amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, as to the authority of the President, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled against President Nixon, reasserting the constitutional requirement of the President to spend funds that the Congress enacted and that he had signed into law. The Supreme Court said he has no power to impound. Title X of the Budget Act established a procedure to allow Presidents to impound in partnership with the Congress—that is how the rescission process came into being. The Budget Act dealt the President in, it created a method to reduce Federal spending in consort with another coequal branch of the Government. My friends, that is what we are doing here today, we are letting the process go forward.

Mr. Chairman, what the Appropriations Committee has done is responsible and in the spirit of the title X rescission process. I hope we have put to rest these misapprehensions about the process.

Mr. AUCCOIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not want my vote for this bill to be taken as a sign of support for the *Seawolf* attack submarine or any other particular program, and am, therefore, taking this opportunity to explain my position.

I support the House rescission package because it's far preferable to no rescission. In addition, there are a number of nuclear and space weapons in this bill that were designed under defective strategies and defective requirements, and I am pleased to support their rescission. These include the MX, SRAM-T, and ASAT.

At the same time, I believe fiscal year 1992 defense spending should be a great deal less

than we have appropriated, and I therefore would have supported a much broader and deeper rescission package had it been offered. In particular, I regard star wars funding as greatly in excess of that program's use in defending us against third-party nuclear attack, and I wish we had cut this program substantially.

On the merits of the *Seawolf*, there is no doubt that attack submarines would dominate any high-intensity naval conflict in the foreseeable future. Nor is there any doubt that even the latest *Los Angeles* class attack submarines are well behind the state of the art, nor that *Seawolf* would be a great deal better.

But on this point the administration is right; the requirement for *Seawolf* is gone. The next generation, the post-Akula generation, of adversary submarines is never going to appear. The *Los Angeles* class is better and more numerous than the Akula or any other foreign attack sub. This means the *Los Angeles* class is all we'll need for a very long time, including for special operations.

Some have argued that cancellation on the *Seawolf* is greater than the cost of buying it. The best figures I have been able to obtain say this is not true, by a wide margin.

So, with all due credit to the creators of this excellent ship, I oppose it.

My vote for this rescission bill is not a vote for one *Seawolf*, but a vote against one *Seawolf*. If I had been given the opportunity, I would have voted against both.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to the comments of the gentleman from Texas.

A myth which is being promoted by a lot of people in this institution and elsewhere is that our Federal deficits have been caused because the Congress has not cooperated with the White House in passing their economic program.

The fact is that the deficits have been created because the Congress has rolled over and given the Presidents his budget and his tax bills lock, stock and barrel, throughout the eighties.

I defy the gentleman from Texas or any other Member of this House to name me 1 year since 1946 when the Congress has changed any President's budget by more than 3 percent.

□ 1430

The fact is you cannot do it. And that 3 percent difference represents, as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has indicated, the difference between a President and a king.

We do not elect kings in this country, we elect Presidents. And the fact is that this committee, in the appropriations process, has cut more spending than we have been asked to cut by the President in the last decade.

The investment portion of the budget, which is part of the budget over which the Committee on Appropriations has control, has been cut as a share of the Federal budget by over 40

percent since the day that Ronald Reagan walked into the White House. That is the portion of the budget which must be strengthened if we want this economy to grow so that we can grow out of the recession and provide meaningful jobs for people who are going to be competing to keep their jobs in the international marketplace.

That is what we ought to be focusing on. And we should not be diverted by these smokescreens that suggest a fault which is not there. The fact is this committee's action exceeds the deficit reductions requested by the President; it ought to be adopted and it ought to be adopted without all of the baloney which is accompanying it.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, we have no additional speakers on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. FAWELL. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add that as far as the Presidential requests are concerned, Congress has ignored him. And over the years since 1974, some \$63 billion the President has requested in rescissions has been set forth and only about \$18 billion has come. The Congress basically has, obviously, the final responsibility regardless of what the President does, regardless of what budget he presents. I think we are all beginning to realize that the Committee on Appropriations has that basic responsibility, but we also have it. And what we are suggesting, I think, in this body is that the Committee on Appropriations will have to open up just a bit and not take offense when people get up on the floor and do question some of your appropriations and do want a part to play because of the serious problems that we have in this Nation.

We just cannot take the viewpoint that an ordinary Member of Congress cannot participate.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think this is baloney, I think it is really serious stuff.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, we yield back the balance of our time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were ayes 150, noes 266, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

AYES—150

Allard	Archer	Atkins
Allen	Armey	Baker

Barton	Hefley	Pickett
Bateman	Henry	Porter
Bereuter	Herger	Pursell
Bilirakis	Hobson	Ramstad
Bliley	Holloway	Ray
Boehner	Hopkins	Rhodes
Broomfield	Houghton	Ridge
Bunning	Hubbard	Riggs
Burton	Hunter	Ritter
Callahan	Hutto	Roberts
Camp	Hyde	Rogers
Chandler	Inhofe	Rohrabacher
Clinger	Ireland	Ros-Lehtinen
Coble	James	Roth
Coleman (MO)	Johnson (TX)	Roukema
Combest	Jontz	Russo
Condit	Kasich	Santorum
Cooper	Kennedy	Saxton
Coughlin	Klug	Schaefer
Cox (CA)	Kyl	Schiff
Crane	Lagomarsino	Schulze
Cunningham	Leach	Sensenbrenner
Davis	Lent	Sharp
DeLay	Lewis (FL)	Shaw
Dickinson	Lowery (CA)	Shuster
Doolittle	Marlenee	Smith (OR)
Dornan (CA)	Martin	Smith (TX)
Dreier	McCandless	Snowe
Duncan	McCollum	Solomon
Edwards (OK)	McCrery	Spence
Emerson	McEwen	Stearns
Ewing	McGrath	Stenholm
Fawell	McMillan (NC)	Stump
Fields	Meyers	Sundquist
Fish	Michel	Swett
Gallegly	Miller (WA)	Taylor (NC)
Gallo	Mollinari	Thomas (CA)
Gekas	Moorhead	Thomas (WY)
Gilchrest	Morella	Upton
Gingrich	Morrison	Vander Jagt
Glickman	Nichols	Vucanovich
Goss	Nussle	Walker
Grandy	Orton	Weldon
Gunderson	Packard	Wolf
Hammerschmidt	Patterson	Wylie
Hancock	Paxon	Young (AK)
Hansen	Penny	Zellmer
Hastert	Petri	Zimmer

NOES—266

Abercrombie	Darden	Gradison
Ackerman	de la Garza	Green
Alexander	DeFazio	Guarini
Anderson	DeLauro	Hall (OH)
Andrews (ME)	Dellums	Hall (TX)
Andrews (NJ)	Derrick	Hamilton
Andrews (TX)	Dicks	Harris
Annunzio	Dingell	Hatcher
Anthony	Dixon	Hayes (IL)
Applegate	Donnelly	Hayes (LA)
Aspin	Dooley	Hefner
Bacchus	Dorgan (ND)	Hertel
Barrett	Downey	Hoagland
Bellenson	Durbin	Hochbrueckner
Bennett	Dwyer	Horn
Bentley	Dymally	Horton
Berman	Early	Hoyer
Bevill	Eckart	Huckaby
Blibray	Edwards (CA)	Hughes
Blackwell	Edwards (TX)	Jacobs
Boehlert	Engel	Jefferson
Bonior	English	Jenkins
Borski	Erdreich	Johnson (CT)
Boucher	Espy	Johnson (SD)
Brewster	Evans	Johnston
Brooks	Fascell	Jones (GA)
Browder	Fazio	Jones (NC)
Brown	Felghan	Kanjorski
Bruce	Flake	Kaptur
Bryant	Foglietta	Kennelly
Bustamante	Ford (MI)	Kildee
Cardin	Ford (TN)	Kleczka
Carper	Frank (MA)	Kolbe
Carr	Franks (CT)	Kopetski
Chapman	Frost	Kostmayer
Clay	Gaydos	LaFalce
Clement	Gedjenson	Lancaster
Coleman (TX)	Gephardt	Lantos
Collins (IL)	Geren	LaRocco
Collins (MI)	Gibbons	Laughlin
Conyers	Gillmor	Lehman (CA)
Costello	Gilman	Levin (MI)
Cox (IL)	Gonzalez	Lewis (CA)
Coyne	Goodling	Lewis (GA)
Cramer	Gordon	Lightfoot

Lipinski Owens (UT) Skelton
Livingston Oxley Slattery
Lloyd Pallone Slaughter
Long Panetta Smith (FL)
Lowey (NY) Parker Smith (IA)
Luken Payne (NJ) Smith (NJ)
Machtley Payne (VA) Solarz
Manton Pease Spratt
Markey Pelosi Staggers
Martinez Perkins Stallings
Matsui Peterson (FL) Stark
Mavroules Peterson (MN) Stokes
Mazzoli Pickle Studds
McCloskey Poshard Swift
McCurdy Price Synar
McDade Quillen Tallon
McDermott Rahall Tanner
McHugh Rangel Tauzin
McMillen (MD) Ravenel Taylor (MS)
McNulty Reed Thomas (GA)
Mfume Regula Thornton
Miller (CA) Richardson Torres
Miller (OH) Rinaldo Torricelli
Mineta Roe Towns
Mink Roemer Traficant
Mollohan Rose Traxler
Montgomery Rostenkowski Unsoeld
Moody Rowland Vento
Moran Roybal Visclosky
Mrazek Sabo Volkmer
Murphy Sanders Walsh
Murtha Sangmeister Washington
Myers Sarpalius Waxman
Nagle Savage Weiss
Natcher Sawyer Wheat
Neal (MA) Scheuer Whitten
Neal (NC) Schroeder Williams
Nowak Schumer Wilson
Oberstar Serrano Wise
Obey Shays Wolpe
Olin Sikorski Wyden
Olver Sisisky Yates
Ortiz Skaggs Young (FL)
Owens (NY) Skeen

NOT VOTING—18

AuCoin Campbell (CO) Oakar
Ballenger Dannemeyer Pastor
Barnard Kolter Valentine
Boxer Lehman (FL) Waters
Byron Levine (CA) Weber
Campbell (CA) Moakley Yatron

□ 1452

Mr. FROST and Mr. DYMALLY changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Messrs. MORRISON, HOBSON, ATKINS, and KENNEDY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] wish to offer amendment No. 2?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, we do not, and respectfully request final passage.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BONIOR] having assumed the chair, Mr. GLICKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4990) rescinding certain budget authority, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 447, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The amendment in part 1 of House Report 102-514 of the Committee on Rules is considered as having been adopted.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 412, noes 2, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

AYES—412

Abercrombie Crane Gunderson
Ackerman Cunningham Hall (OH)
Alexander Darden Hall (TX)
Aillard de la Garza Hamilton
Allen DeFazio Hammerschmidt
Anderson DeLauro Hancock
Andrews (ME) DeLay Hansen
Andrews (NJ) Dellums Harris
Andrews (TX) Derrick Hastert
Annunzio Dickinson Hatcher
Anthony Dicks Hayes (IL)
Applegate Dingell Hayes (LA)
Archer Dixon Hefley
Armey Donnelly Hefner
Aspin Dooley Henry
Atkins Doolittle Herger
Bacchus Dorgan (ND) Hertel
Baker Dornan (CA) Hoagland
Barrett Downey Hobson
Barton Dreier Hochbrueckner
Bateman Duncan Holloway
Bellenson Durbin Hopkins
Bennett Dwyer Horn
Bentley Dymally Horton
Bereuter Early Houghton
Berman Eckart Hoyer
Bevill Edwards (CA) Hubbard
Bilbray Edwards (OK) Huckaby
Billakis Edwards (TX) Hughes
Blackwell Emerson Hunter
Billey Engel Hutto
Boehlt English Hyde
Boehner Erdreich Inhofe
Bonior Espy Ireland
Borski Evans Jacobs
Boucher Ewing James
Brewster Fascell Jefferson
Brooks Fawell Jenkins
Browder Fazio Johnson (CT)
Brown Feighan Johnson (SD)
Bruce Fields Johnson (TX)
Bryant Fish Johnston
Bunning Flake Jones (GA)
Burton Foglietta Jones (NC)
Bustamante Ford (MI) Jontz
Callahan Ford (TN) Kanjorski
Camp Frank (MA) Kaptur
Cardin Franks (CT) Kasich
Carper Frost Kennelly
Carr Gallegly Kildee
Chandler Gallo Kleczka
Chapman Gaydos Klug
Clay Gejdenson Kolbe
Clement Gekas Kopetski
Clinger Gephardt Kostmayer
Coble Geren Kyl
Coleman (MO) Gibbons LaFalce
Coleman (TX) Gilchrist Lagomarsino
Collins (IL) Gillmor Lancaster
Collins (MI) Gilman Lantos
Combest Gingrich LaRocco
Condit Glickman Laughlin
Conyers Gonzalez Leach
Cooper Goodling Lehman (CA)
Costello Gordon Lent
Coughlin Goss Levin (MI)
Cox (CA) Gradison Lewis (CA)
Cox (IL) Grandy Lewis (FL)
Coyne Green Lewis (GA)
Cramer Guarini Lightfoot

Lipinski Patterson Skelton
Lloyd Paxon Slattery
Long Payne (NJ) Slaughter
Lowery (CA) Payne (VA) Smith (FL)
Lowey (NY) Pease Smith (IA)
Luken Pelosi Smith (NJ)
Machtley Penny Smith (OR)
Manton Perkins Smith (TX)
Markey Peterson (FL) Snowe
Marlenee Peterson (MN) Solarz
Martin Petri Solomon
Martinez Pickett Spence
Matsui Pickle Spratt
Mavroules Porter Staggers
Mazzoli Poshard Stallings
McCandless Price Stark
McCloskey Pursell Stearns
McCollum Quillen Stenholm
McCrery Rahall Stokes
McCurdy Ramstad Studds
McDade Rangel Stump
McDermott Ravenel Sundquist
McEwen Ray Swett
McGrath Reed Swift
McHugh Regula Synar
McMillan (NC) Rhodes Tallon
McMillen (MD) Richardson Tanner
McNulty Ridge Tauzin
Meyers Riggs Taylor (MS)
Mfume Rinaldo Taylor (NC)
Michel Ritter Thomas (CA)
Miller (CA) Roberts Thomas (GA)
Miller (OH) Roe Thomas (WY)
Miller (WA) Roemer Thornton
Mineta Rogers Torres
Mink Rohrabacher Torricelli
Molnari Ros-Lehtinen Towns
Mollohan Rose Traficant
Montgomery Rostenkowski Traxler
Moody Roth Unsoeld
Moorhead Roukema Upton
Moran Rowland Vander Jagt
Morella Roybal Vento
Morrison Russo Visclosky
Mrazek Sabo Volkmer
Murphy Sanders Vucanovich
Murtha Sangmeister Walker
Myers Santorum Walsh
Nagle Sarpalius Washington
Natcher Savage Waxman
Neal (MA) Sawyer Weiss
Neal (NC) Saxton Weldon
Nichols Schaefer Wheat
Nowak Scheuer Whitten
Nussle Schiff Williams
Oberstar Schroeder Wilson
Obey Schulze Wise
Olin Schumer Wolf
Olver Sensenbrenner Wolpe
Ortiz Serrano Wyden
Orton Sharp Wylie
Owens (NY) Shaw Yates
Owens (UT) Shays Young (AK)
Oxley Shuster Young (FL)
Packard Sikorski Zelliff
Pallone Sisisky Zimmer
Panetta Skaggs
Parker Skeen

NOES—2

Davis Kennedy

NOT VOTING—20

AuCoin Campbell (CO) Oakar
Ballenger Dannemeyer Pastor
Barnard Kolter Valentine
Boxer Lehman (FL) Waters
Broomfield Levine (CA) Weber
Byron Livingston Yatron
Campbell (CA) Moakley

□ 1514

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 4990), rescinding certain budget authority, and for other purposes, and that I may include extraneous and tabular material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KAPTUR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in a meeting with the President of Honduras a little while ago during rollcall vote No. 113, final passage of H.R. 4900, a bill to rescind \$5.8 billion in spending programs. While I object, Madam Speaker, to the inclusion of three projects in the committee bill, had I been present I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASTOR. Madam Speaker, today this body will be considering an important piece of legislation. H.R. 4900 proposes to rescind a number of different budget authorities throughout our Government. In this time of runaway deficits, these rescissions are important in helping to reduce our Nation's debt and saving the taxpayer billions of dollars.

The bill goes beyond the President's proposal and calls for \$142 million more in rescissions that was requested. In fact, since 1981 Congress has rescinded a total of \$410 million more than requested by President Bush and Reagan.

Official business has required my presence back in my district. Had I been present however, I would like the RECORD to show my position on the following votes cast during today's consideration of H.R. 4990:

Rollcall No. 108 on the question of approving the Journal, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall No. 109 on the motion to table, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall No. 110 on moving the previous question on the rule, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall No. 111 on agreeing to the rule, I would have voted "aye."

Rollcall No. 112 on agreeing to the Fawell amendment to H.R. 4990, I would have voted "nay."

Rollcall No. 113 on agreeing to final passage of H.R. 4990, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall votes 109 through 113. Had I been present during these votes, I would have voted "Nay" on rollcalls No. 109 through No. 111, and "Yea" on rollcalls No. 112 through No. 113.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, due to the events in Los Angeles, and in particular the 29th Congressional District,

I was unavoidably detained during regular business on May 7. Had I been present for the votes I missed I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall vote 108: "Yes."

Rollcall vote 109: "Yes."

Rollcall vote 110: "Yes."

Rollcall vote 111: "Yes."

Rollcall vote 112: "No."

Rollcall vote 113: "Yes."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute)

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of engaging the majority leader in a colloquy about the remainder of the schedule for this week and next.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri for that purpose, if he could enlighten us.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I would say to the gentleman there will be no more votes today and no session tomorrow. On Monday, the House will meet at noon. There will not be legislative business. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon to take up H.R. 2039, the Legal Services Reauthorization Act, the complete consideration, and then six bills on suspension:

First, S. 2344, Veterans' Health Program Amendments of 1992;

Second, S. 452, transfer of administrative authority over certain land to the Secretary of the Interior;

Third, S. 1182, Fishlake National Forest Enlargement Act;

Fourth, H.R. 1514, to disclaim all right to certain lands conditionally relinquished to the United States;

Fifth, H.R. 3681, to establish Democracy Day;

Sixth, H.R. 4384, appeal rights for certain employees of the Veterans' Health Administration.

On Wednesday, May 13, and Thursday, May 14, the House will meet at 2 on Wednesday and at 11 a.m. on Thursday to consider H.R. 2056, the Shipbuilding Trade Reform Act of 1992, H.R. 4111, the Small Business Credit Crunch Relief Act of 1992, and House Concurrent Resolution 287, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1993 conference report.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, if the majority leader would perhaps say again, it is my understanding that there will be no votes on Monday at all.

Mr. GEPHARDT. That is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. How early might votes occur on Tuesday, would the gentleman have any idea?

Mr. GEPHARDT. The House will meet at noon. There are a number of amendments, four or five, left on the Legal Services bill. They are timed under the rule. I would say about an

hour or so after the business begins there is likely to be a vote. There could be, obviously, a vote right after noon, if a quorum call is held or a Journal vote is ordered.

Mr. SOLOMON. If the majority leader would also perhaps tell us, there is word, I am hearing, from the Committee on Rules upstairs that there is a possibility that we might consider the Los Angeles supplemental aid of some kind. Is that possible for next week?

Mr. GEPHARDT. There is no plan at this point, but if there is a decision to try to move with that legislation we will obviously consult with the minority before action is taken.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, the minority whip.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all, on our side, we would look forward to working with the Democratic leadership when the President gets back, if, in fact, he does request some immediate action. I think we may have an opportunity to actually surprise the country and prove we can produce something on a bipartisan basis, and do it fairly quickly.

Let me say, second, I just want to raise the issue, and I do not mean to in any way put the majority leader on the spot, but I would hope that he would go back to his caucus and ask them if we might on Tuesday reach some kind of agreement on the Committee on Rules and C-SPAN. As the gentleman knows, this week has been sort of bizarre, and I think to some extent it got out of hand probably for reasons that are internal to the committee.

It just seemed to those of us, and I know that the majority leader has been one of those who has always been for openness, and those of us who are proud of the House's record over the last 14 years in being remarkably open to the entire planet would like to find some bipartisan way to go back and establish a pattern where, barring genuine secrecy requirements for national security or personnel records, normally committees would routinely accommodate C-SPAN's remarkable practice of coverage without editorial.

I do not mean to put the gentleman from Missouri on the spot, but if he has any comment, or if he might check back with his caucus and let us know next week, I just think it would be a healthy thing for us to reestablish that pattern.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his inquiry. I am not fully aware of the circumstances that surrounded that deci-

sion by the committee, but I will be happy to talk with the Members and to talk with the Members on the other side about it, including the minority whip, and see what can be agreed upon.

□ 1520

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman. Have a nice weekend.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KAPTUR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 11, 1992

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4750

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] be removed as a cosponsor on H.R. 4750.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING CERTAIN AUTHORITIES RELATING TO ADMINISTRATION OF VETERANS' LAWS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2378) to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain authorities relating to the administration of veterans laws, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] for an explanation of S. 2378, as amended.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, last year the House passed and sent to the Senate, legislation that would have enhanced the ability of VA to deliver quality health care to veterans in several ways. In addition, the legislation would have provided authority for VA to continue several important benefit programs as well. We had thought the other body would accept the bill; however, the bill did not clear the other body prior to adjournment.

It was most unfortunate that we were unable to get the bill to the President. By failing to do so, the authority for VA to continue some very worthwhile programs has now expired. S. 2378 would extend VA's authority to continue these programs.

If enacted, the bill would allow VA to:

Operate and maintain the veterans benefits regional office in the Philippines;

Provide vocational training to certain non-service-connected disabled veterans through this calendar year;

Establish and operate nonprofit research corporations at some VA medical centers through this calendar year; and

Continue to collect data on whether veterans who apply are receiving medical care from the VA during the current fiscal year.

S. 2378 would not increase the deficit. In fact, the enactment of this legislation would save \$3 million in fiscal year 1992 and \$1 million in fiscal year 1993. At the end of my remarks, I am inserting for the RECORD a copy of the CBO estimate on the bill dated May 5, 1992.

These are all good programs and I urge my colleagues to support S. 2378.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 5, 1992.

Hon. G.V. MONTGOMERY,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: At the request of your staff, the Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for S. 2378, a bill to extend certain expiring veterans' programs, as passed in the Senate on April 30, 1992. The bill would affect direct spending and, thus, would be subject to pay-as-you-go procedures under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. As a result, the estimate required under clause 8 of House Rule XXI also is attached.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. BLUM
(For Robert D. Reischauer, Director).

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE—COST
ESTIMATE

1. Bill number: S. 2378.
2. Bill title: None.
3. Bill status: As passed in the Senate, April 30, 1992.
4. Bill purpose: To extend certain expiring veterans' programs, and for other purposes.

5. Estimated cost to the Federal Government:

(By fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997
Direct spending:						
Budget authority	-3	-1	0	0	0	0
Outlays	-3	-1	0	0	0	0
Authorization:						
Estimated authorization level	3	3	2	0	0	0
Outlays	3	3	2	0	0	0

Basis of estimate: The following section-by-section cost analysis only those sections of the bill that could be expected to result in a significant budgetary impact.

Section 1: This section would extend through March 31, 1994, the authority of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to maintain a regional office in the Philippines.

(By fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997
Estimated authorization level	3	3	2	0	0	0
Outlays	3	3	2	0	0	0

According to VA \$2.4 million in General Operating Expenses funds were spent in 1991 to operate the Manila regional office. This amount was increased in future years for anticipated inflation.

Section 2: This section would extend through December 31, 1992, the authority of the VA to conduct vocational rehabilitation programs for certain compensation and pension recipients.

(By fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997
Budget authority	(1)	(1)	0	0	0	0
Outlays	(1)	(1)	0	0	0	0

¹ Less than \$500,000.

Fewer than 300 individuals are expected to receive training through these programs during the extension period at a cost of slightly less than \$500,000 in 1992 and around \$100,000 in 1993.

Section 5: This section would authorize the VA to guaranty the real estate mortgage investment conduits (REMICs) that are used to market vendee loans. This authority would expire on December 31, 1992.

(By fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997
Budget authority	-3	-1	0	0	0	0
Outlays	-3	-1	0	0	0	0

The loans that make up the REMICs affected by this provision are guaranteed against default under current law. In addition to the guaranty against default loss, this provision would authorize the guaranty of timely payment of principal and interest on the certificates issued by the REMIC. The effects of this provision are direct spending because the VA home loan program and all its component accounts are mandatory spending.

Cash reserves and other elements of the REMIC credit structure make the likelihood of delayed payments extremely remote under current law. Therefore, a timely payment guaranty would not significantly affect the government's risk on these loans. Nevertheless, it is estimated by First Boston Corporation, VA's current lead underwriter for REMIC sales, that a timely payment guaranty would reduce the yield that must be offered to investors by 5 to 15 basis points (One percentage point equals 100 basis points), primarily by making VA REMICs look more like other insured REMICs. Reducing the

yield on the certificates would lower the payout to the certificate holders and, thereby, increase the sale proceeds to VA. In addition, certain costs related to the sale would be eliminated, such as Securities and Exchange Commission registration and credit rating.

The above estimate assumes that this legislation will be enacted before the next loan sale, scheduled for the end of May. If enactment is delayed beyond this date, the 1992 savings would fall to \$1.5 million.

6. Pay-as-you-go considerations: The Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts through 1995. The spending increases that would result from sections 2 and 5 of S. 2378 would have the following pay-as-you-go impact:

(By fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1992	1993	1994	1995
Outlays	-3	-1	0	0
Receipts	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

¹ Not applicable.

7. Estimated cost to state and local government: The Congressional Budget Office has determined that the budgets of state and local governments would not be significantly affected by the enactment of this bill.

8. Estimate comparison: None.

9. Previous CBO estimate: On April 3, 1992, CBO issued a cost estimate of S. 2378 as introduced in the Senate. That estimate was identical to the above estimate with the exception of section 5, which was added in an amendment on the Senate floor.

10. Estimate prepared by: K.W. Shepherd.

11. Estimate approved by: C.G. Nuckols, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE¹

The applicable cost estimate of this Act for all purposes of sections 252 and 253 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be as follows:

(By fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1992	1993	1994	1995
Change in outlays	-3	-1	0	0
Change in receipts	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

¹ Not applicable.

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his explanation.

Madam Speaker, I support passage of S. 2378, as amended, a bill to extend certain necessary authorities relating to the administration of veterans laws. Our chairman, Mr. MONTGOMERY, has explained the bill and I associate myself with his remarks. Also, I want to commend Mr. MONTGOMERY for promptly moving this legislation after the Senate passed it. It seems hard to believe, but here we are in May, and we are still picking up loose ends from last year.

We ended the last session without Senate action on these veterans' authorizations which the House had passed. Hopefully, in this otherwise difficult year, we will be able to act more expeditiously on veterans' legislation.

I urge favorable consideration of these reauthorizations.

¹ An estimate of S. 2378, to extend certain expiring programs for veterans, as passed in the Senate on Apr. 30, 1992. This estimate was transmitted by the Congressional Budget Office on May 5, 1992.

Mr. APPLEGATE. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman SONNY MONTGOMERY for taking this timely action.

Madam Speaker, I simply want to indicate my support for this bill, as it contains provisions which will permit the Department of Veterans Affairs to operate its Manila Regional Office through March 1994. It also would extend through this calendar year the Secretary's authority to conduct two vocational rehabilitation programs benefiting severely disabled veterans, whether they are suffering from service-connected or non-service-connected disabilities. My Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, and Insurance will conduct a hearing later this year on these programs with an eye toward making these programs permanent. There are good programs for disabled veterans and I am very pleased to support the bill.

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2378

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO MAINTAIN THE REGIONAL OFFICE IN THE PHILIPPINES.

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 315(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "September 30, 1991" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1994".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as of September 30, 1991.

(c) RATIFICATION OF MAINTENANCE OF OFFICE DURING LAPSED PERIOD.—Any action of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in maintaining a Department of Veterans Affairs Regional Office in the Republic of the Philippines under section 315(b) of title 38, United States Code, during the period beginning on October 1, 1991, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act is hereby ratified with respect to that period.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITIES RELATIONS TO CERTAIN TEMPORARY PROGRAMS.

(a) PROGRAM FOR TRAIL WORK PERIODS AND VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.—Section 1163(a)(2)(B) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "January 31, 1992" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1992".

(b) PROGRAM OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING FOR NEW PENSION RECIPIENTS.—Section 1524(a)(4) of such title is amended by striking out "January 31, 1992" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1992".

(c) PROTECTION OF HEALTH-CARE ELIGIBILITY.—Section 1525(b)(2) of such title is amended by striking out "January 31, 1992" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1992".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) through (c) shall take effect as of January 31, 1992.

(e) RATIFICATION OF ACTIONS DURING LAPSED PERIOD.—The following actions of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs during the period beginning on February 1, 1992, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act are hereby ratified with respect to that period:

(1) A failure to reduce the disability rating of a veteran who began to engage in a substantially gainful occupation during that period.

(2) The provision of a vocational training program (including related evaluations and other related services) to a veteran under section 1524 of title 38, United States Code, and the making of related determinations under that section.

(3) The provision of health care and services to a veteran pursuant to section 1525 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 3. AUTHORITIES RELATING TO RESEARCH CORPORATIONS.

(a) PERIOD FOR OBTAINING RECOGNITION AS TAX-EXEMPT ENTITY.—Section 7361(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "three-year period" and inserting in lieu thereof "four-year period".

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF CORPORATION.—Section 7368 of such title is amended by striking out "September 30, 1991" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1992".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect as of October 1, 1991.

(d) RATIFICATION FOR LAPSED PERIOD.—The following actions of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs during the period beginning on October 1, 1991, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act are hereby ratified:

(1) A failure to dissolve a nonprofit corporation established under section 7361(a) of title 38, United States Code, that, within the three-year period beginning on the date of the establishment of the corporation, was not recognized as an entity the income of which is exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) The establishment of a nonprofit corporation for approved research under section 7361(a) of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENT OF ANNUAL REPORT ON FURNISHING HEALTH CARE.

Section 1901(e)(1) of the Veterans' Health-Care Amendments of 1986 (38 U.S.C. 1710 note) is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1991" and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1992".

SEC. 5. ENHANCED LOAN ASSET SALE AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Section 3720 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(h)(1) The Secretary may, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate, issue or approve the issuance of, and guarantee the timely payment of principal and interest on, certificates or other securities evidencing an interest in a pool of mortgage loans made in connection with the sale of properties acquired under this chapter.

"(2) The Secretary may not under this subsection guarantee the payment of principal and interest on certificates or other securities issued or approved after December 31, 1992".

(b) TREATMENT OF PROCEEDS.—Section 3733(e) of such title is amended by inserting ", and the amount received from the sale of securities under section 3720(h) of this title," after "subsection (a)(1) of this section."

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all

Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 2378, the Senate bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE NATIONAL AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 251) to designate the month of May 1992 as "National Huntington's Disease Awareness Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MEYERS of Kansas. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, as the chief sponsor of the House version of Senate Joint Resolution 251, I rise in support of this Senate joint resolution.

Huntington's disease is a hereditary neurological disorder which directly affects 1 in 10,000 Americans. The disease produces radical physical changes over a period of 10 to 20 years—affecting coordination, speech, and control of movement—as well as profound mental changes—diminishing the power to think, remember, or reason. The disease causes a very slow deterioration of a person's neurological functions, which is emotionally devastating and very costly for the victims and their families. There is at present no cure and it is a fatal disease.

Recent advances in genetic research have given those who are affected by Huntington's disease hope that an effective treatment and possible cure will soon be found. In 1983, scientists discovered a genetic flag known as a marker, indicating the nearby presence in a person's DNA of the gene which causes Huntington's disease. Dr. Francis Collins, the discoverer of the genes for cystic fibrosis and neurofibromatosis, is one of the many expert researchers around the country working to find the gene which causes the disease. Increased Federal funding of medical research would hasten the search for the Huntington's disease gene.

I firmly believe that the designation of May 1992 as National Huntington's Disease Awareness Month will generate the interest and momentum necessary to increase research funding for Huntington's disease, and to find a cure for this devastating disease.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 251

Whereas twenty-five thousand Americans are victims of Huntington's disease, a fatal, hereditary, neurological disorder;

Whereas an additional one hundred and twenty-five thousand Americans have a 50-percent chance of inheriting the gene responsible for Huntington's disease from an affected parent and are considered to be "at-risk" for the disease;

Whereas tens of thousands of other Americans experience the destructive effects of the disease, including suffering from the social stigma associated with the disease, assuming the difficult role of caring for a loved victim of the disease, witnessing the prolonged, irreversible physical and mental deterioration of a loved one, and agonizing over the death of a loved one;

Whereas at present there is no cure for Huntington's disease and no means available to retard or reverse the effects of the disease;

Whereas a victim of the later stages of Huntington's disease invariably requires total personal care, the provision of which often results in devastating financial consequences for the victim and the victim's family;

Whereas recent advances in the field of molecular genetics have enabled scientists to locate approximately the gene-site responsible for Huntington's disease;

Whereas many of the novel techniques resulting from these advances have also been instrumental in locating the gene-sites responsible for familial Alzheimer's disease, manic depression, kidney cancer, and other disorders;

Whereas increased Federal funding of medical research could facilitate additional advances and result in the discovery of the cause and chemical processes of Huntington's disease and the development of strategies to stop and reverse the progress of the disease;

Whereas Huntington's disease typifies other late-onset, behavioral genetic disorders by presenting the victim and the victim's family with a broad range of biomedical, psychological, social, and economic problems; and

Whereas in the absence of a cure for Huntington's disease, victims of the disease deserve to live with dignity and be regarded as full and respected family members and members of society; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the month of May 1992 is designated as "National Huntington's Disease Awareness Month", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE CHILD SUPPORT ECONOMIC SECURITY ACT OF 1992

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Child Support Economic Security Act of 1992. This bill will strengthen the child support enforcement system to ensure that children have a regular, reliable source of income from their non-custodial parents.

This bill contains 16 distinct measures that tighten the child support enforcement program and close loopholes through which noncustodial parents are able to shirk their financial obligations to their children. It also includes amendments to title II of the United States Code that will make it more difficult for noncustodial parents who declare bankruptcy to avoid their financial obligations to their children and former spouses.

The failure to pay child support is a national disgrace. In 1989, the most recent year for which data are available, there was a \$5 billion shortfall between the \$16.3 billion owed and the actual amount collected. Each year, just one-half of child support obligations are paid in full, and 25 percent are never made. This bill help children and families owed these obligations.

The media are just beginning to understand what a pervasive problem child support enforcement is. Just recently, the Denver Post published a series of articles on this subject. Last week, Newsweek's cover story focused on deadbeat dads. This week, ABC's "Prime Time" will feature an investigative story on child support enforcement and the McNeil/Lehrer Program also has a story in the works.

But this is not a new story. It is, however, a story whose parameters continue to grow as the number of children living with just one parent continues to grow. Twenty-five percent of children now live in single-parent families, a figure that has doubled over the past 20 years. As a result, the need to improve the collection of child support has become more urgent.

Most children in single-parent families—87 percent—live with their mothers. Since women, on average, earn barely two-thirds of what men earn, most women who head single-parent households are at an economic disadvantage compared with their non-custodial exspouses, and they rely heavily on child support to ease their financial burdens.

In fact, a recent study from the U.S. Bureau of the Census that followed a set of nearly 52,000 children from October 1983 through May 1986, found that within 4 months of their parents' separation, the family income of children declined by 37 percent. Equally disturbing, the percent of children living in poverty increased from 19 to 36 percent in the first 4 months following their parents' separation. And the number of children relying on Aid to Families with Dependent Children [AFDC] doubled during this same timeframe, increasing from 9 to 18 percent. Similarly, the number of food recipients nearly tripled during the first year of parental separation.

What these disturbing facts tell us is that children rely heavily on their father's incomes for support while their parents are living together, and that ongoing support from the noncustodial parent is critical if children are to avoid poverty after their parents divorce.

Since 1975, Congress has been trying to improve the child support enforcement system to ensure that noncustodial parents continue their financial support responsibilities to their children and to keep so many children in single-parent families from tumbling into poverty. In order to expedite child support payments, Congress amended the Child Support Enforcement Program in 1984 and again in 1988. Our intent was to make child support payments a regular, reliable source of income.

But in spite of these reforms, the system still fails to make collections in too many cases.

Everyone, from child support administrators to child advocates, agrees that child support enforcement measures are not working well. Wage withholding of child support payments, the cornerstone of the Child Support Enforcement Program, is not working as well as we would have hoped. In part, this is due to the inability of the system to track missing noncustodial parents and initiate wage withholding procedures. Other nonpayers slip through the system because they do not receive regular wages from an employer.

I receive letters weekly from distraught parents from all over the country who are unable to make ends meet because of child support delinquencies. They write of endless delays, some longer than a year, before child support payments are withheld from the wages of a noncustodial parent. Others report the failure of the system to locate a parent who has moved without leaving a forwarding address. On average, it takes 1 year to locate an absent parent, and 2 years to establish a court order if a parent has deserted. In spite of the best efforts of IV-D agencies around the country, they are too understaffed and too underautomated to handle the volume of cases that pass through the system. This just won't do.

Children who live in a State other than that of the absent parent are in the greatest economic peril. A new study from the General Accounting Office on interstate child support collection found that 1-in-3 noncustodial parents who lives out-of-state has never made a child support payment, and another 232 percent fail to make regular payments. A major factor in nonpayment is the lack of timeliness in locating the noncustodial parent. In one out of four cases the noncustodial parent has left an employer by the time the order to withhold child support is served.

In July, after nearly 2 years of intensive work, the U.S. Commission on Interstate Child Support will present its recommendations for improving interstate child support enforcement to Congress. For some time, the Commission has been circulating drafts of its recommendations for review and comment. The legislation that I am introducing today is based on several of the Commission's recommendations, but in some cases goes further than the Commission in closing loopholes that noncustodial parents have used to avoid paying child support.

The Child Support Economic Security Act of 1992:

- Mandates uniform, statewide systems of child support enforcement;

- Mandates IV-D agency access to all State and local databases;

- Mandates child support payments until the child reaches age 18, graduates from high school, marries, or is emancipated, and extends child support beyond the age of 18 if the child is disabled;

- Mandates withholding of child support arrearages from all forms of income, including lottery winnings, insurance payments, and State court awards;

- Prevents recording of property transactions unless arrearages have been paid;

- Prohibits the provision, renewal, or reissuance of licenses unless provisions are made to pay current support and arrearages;

- Mandates reporting to consumer credit reporting agencies of overdue support and allows such information to be reported upon request by consumer credit reporting agencies;

- Eliminates the statute of limitation for the collection of arrearages;

- Requires the recording of Social Security numbers on marriage licenses and child support orders;

- Clarifies the separate treatment of issues related to visitation and child support;

- Requires regulations for timely response to interstate locate requests, based on the state of available technology;

- Requires States to adopt the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act as adopted by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws;

- Establishes a national commission to research and draft national child support guidelines; and

- Amends the Federal Bankruptcy Code to ensure that support owed to children and custodial parents is not discharged by a bankruptcy proceeding.

This legislation represents a major step forward to ensure a measure of economic security to children who are dependent on child support payments. The receipt of child support should be as automatic as Social Security benefits are for the elderly.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in cosponsoring this important legislation. As a nation, we must realize that paying child support is a fundamental civic responsibility, and should be as ingrained as paying taxes. While those with child support obligations may choose to run, they should not be allowed to hide. We owe this much to our children.

□ 1530

GALLEGLY BILL TO EXTEND TARGETED JOBS CREDIT TO DISLOCATED DEFENSE WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a bill to make dislocated defense workers eligible for the targeted jobs tax credit.

We are fortunate to be living at a time when there are few serious threats to world peace, thanks in large part to the determination and military strength of the United States. We have heard repeatedly the promise of some sort of "peace dividend" as a result of the planned reductions in our defense spending and downsizing of our military forces. The sad truth is that, thanks to the huge budget deficit and outstanding domestic spending programs, whatever peace dividend there might be from projected defense cutbacks has already been committed. Moreover, as a consequence of cutbacks, many of our best-trained, most productive and most patriotic citizens are already paying a steep price for this dividend.

Over the next 5 years, one quarter of our Armed Forces—approximately 450,000 active duty personnel—is scheduled for displacement. In addition, some 150,000 civilians will be let go from their military jobs. According to Business Week magazine, if defense spending is slashed by \$150 billion over the next 5 years, as proposed, over 3.3 million jobs will be lost in the private sector.

The Federal Government has an obligation to try to help the millions of Americans who will lose their jobs through no fault of their own, but as a direct result of reductions in defense expenditures that their own contributions to winning the cold war helped make possible. Americans from all walks of life have served their country with pride and distinction, out of patriotic duty and a commitment to fight for peace and freedom and to protect America

from the threat of world communism. Many of them have come to look upon military service as a career. Despite promises of promotion and adventure, thousands of men and women in uniform are suddenly facing forced separation. Their dreams for the future have been dashed in our rush to downsize our military forces to fit the demands of a new world order and meet the needs of a peacetime defense.

Our Nation's defenses include not only the military services, the officers and enlisted men and women on active duty and in the National Guard and the Reserves. They also include the many industries and large and small businesses employing millions of civilian workers who produce the planes, ships, and weaponry, the machines and materials, and the aerospace and electronic tools that have enabled America to remain No. 1 in the world and meet its cold war defense needs. In our eagerness to cut back the defense budget overnight, we are contributing to the current economic recession by pushing many firms into bankruptcy and by throwing their employees out of work, into unemployment lines and onto welfare and forcing their families into anxiety and despair.

Under the circumstances, I believe that we have an obligation to help these victims of demobilization. These men and women have already paid their dues. They have proven that they can hold down a job and carry responsibility; that they have the education, training, experience, and the desire to make a positive contribution to work force productivity and to our Nation's global competitiveness. What these people need most of all is a new job, the opportunity to prove themselves and be productive members of society again. What I propose is the incentive for an employer to hire them and train them for that new job.

I propose that the targeted jobs tax credit [TJTC] be extended to cover dislocated defense workers who, because of reductions in defense expenditures, have lost their jobs through no fault of their own. The new members of this targeted group are all victims of defense cutbacks—those military personnel who are involuntarily separated, but honorably discharged; Defense Department civilian employees involuntarily terminated; and employees involuntarily terminated from defense-related jobs in the private sector. The credit would be available to an employer who hires a dislocated worker within 1 year of his or her separation from a previous defense-related job.

TJTC is a program that has already proven successful in promoting employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged youth, Vietnam-era veterans, cooperative education teenagers, ex-offenders, vocational rehabilitation referrals, and persons on AFDC, SSI, and other general assistance programs. The targeted jobs credit relies on the private sector, rather than Government, using a simple, straightforward fiscal mechanism now available to business. It requires no new Federal bureaucracy nor a welfare handout.

This legislation provides a practical, cost-effective approach to a pressing problem. Given the uncertain state of our economy and the lives that are involved, I urge immediate congressional consideration of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DISLOCATED DEFENSE WORKERS TREATED AS MEMBERS OF TARGETED GROUP.

(a) *General Rule.*—Paragraph (1) of section 51(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining members of a targeted group) is amended by striking "or" at the end of subparagraph (I), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (J), and inserting ", or", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(K) a dislocated defense worker."

(b) **DISLOCATED DEFENSE WORKER.**—Subsection (d) of section 51 of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraphs (13), (14), (15), and (16), as paragraphs (14), (15), (16), and (17), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (12) the following new paragraph:

"(13) **DISLOCATED DEFENSE WORKER.**—The term 'dislocated defense worker' means any individual—

"(A) if—

"(i) the Secretary of Defense certifies that—

"(I) such individual had been involuntarily separated (within the meaning of section 1141 of title 10, United States Code) from the Armed Forces as the result of reductions in defense expenditures, or

"(II) such individual had been involuntarily terminated from civilian employment in the Defense Department as the result of reductions in defense expenditures, or

"(ii) the designated local agency certifies that such individual was involuntarily terminated from employment by an employer (other than a governmental body) as the result of reductions in such employer's business caused by reductions in defense expenditures, and

"(B) if the hiring date is during the 1-year period beginning on the date of the involuntary separation or termination (as the case may be) referred to in subparagraph (A).

For purposes of paragraph (17), any reference to the designated local agency shall, in the case of individuals referred to in subparagraph (A)(i), include a reference to the Secretary of Defense."

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to individuals who begin work for the employer after the date of the enactment of this Act.

THE SINEWS OF PEACE AND THE RIVER OF TIME AND THE IMPERATIVE OF ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1946, the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill, went to Missouri at the request of President Truman and delivered a speech at what was later to become my alma mater, Westminster College, entitled "The Sinews of Peace," otherwise known as "the Iron Curtain speech." It has been said of this speech that it may be regarded as the most important Churchill delivered as leader of the opposition during the period 1945 to 1951.

It contains certain phrases: "The special relationship," "the sinews of

peace," which at once entered into general use and which have survived, but it is the passage on "the Iron Curtain" which attracted immediate international attention and had incalculable impact upon public opinion in the United States and in Western Europe.

Russian historians date the beginning of the cold war from this speech. In its phraseology, in its intricate drawing together of several themes to an electrifying climax, this speech may be regarded as a technical classic.

Yesterday, May 6, 1992, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke from the very same podium Winston Churchill spoke from in 1946 and delivered an address entitled "The River of Time and the Imperative of Action."

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I am enclosing Mr. Churchill's speech of March 5, 1946, and Mr. Gorbachev's speech of yesterday.

THE SINEWS OF PEACE

[By Winston Churchill]

I am glad to come to Westminster College this afternoon, and am complimented that you should give me a degree. The name "Westminster" is somehow familiar to me. I seem to have heard of it before. Indeed it was at Westminster that I received a very large part of my education in politics, dialectic, rhetoric, and one or two other things. In fact we have both been educated at the same, or similar, or, at any rate, kindred establishments.

It is also an honour, perhaps almost unique, for a private visitor to be introduced to an academic audience by the President of the United States. Amid his heavy burdens, duties, and responsibilities—unsought but not recoiled from—the President has travelled a thousand miles to dignify and magnify our meeting here today and to give me an opportunity of addressing this kindred nation, as well as my own countrymen across the ocean, and perhaps some other countries too. The President has told you that it is his wish, as I am sure it is yours, that I should have full liberty to give my true and faithful counsel in these anxious and baffling times. I shall certainly avail myself of this freedom, and feel the more right to do so because any private ambitions I may have cherished in my younger days have been satisfied beyond my wildest dreams. Let me, however, make it clear that I have no official mission or status of any kind, and that I speak only for myself. There is nothing here but what you see.

I can therefore allow my mind, with the experience of a lifetime, to play over the problems which beset us on the morrow of our absolute victory in arms, and to try to make sure with what strength I have that what has been gained with so much sacrifice and suffering shall be preserved for the future glory and safety of mankind.

The United States stands at this time at the pinnacle of world power. It is a solemn moment for the American Democracy. For with primacy in power is also joined an awe-inspiring accountability to the future. If you look around you, you must feel not only the sense of duty done but also you must feel anxiety lest you fall below the level of achievement. Opportunity is here now, clear and shining for both our countries. To reject it or ignore it or fritter it away will bring upon us all the long reproaches of the after-time. It is necessary that constancy of mind,

persistence of purpose, and the grand simplicity of decision shall guide and rule the conduct of the English-speaking peoples in peace as they did in war. We must, and I believe we shall, prove ourselves equal to this severe requirement.

When American military men approach some serious situation they are wont to write at the head of their directive the words "over-all strategic concept." There is wisdom in this, as it leads to clarity of thought. What then is the over-all strategic concept which we should inscribe today? It is nothing less than the safety and welfare, the freedom and progress, of all the homes and families of all the men and women in all the lands. And here I speak particularly of the myriad cottage or apartment homes where the wage-earner strives amid the accidents and difficulties of life to guard his wife and children from privation and bring the family up in the fear of the Lord, or upon ethical conceptions which often play their potent part.

To give security to these countless homes, they must be shielded from the two giant marauders, war and tyranny. We all know the frightful disturbances in which the ordinary family is plunged when the curse of war swoops down upon the bread-winner and those for whom he works and contrives. The awful ruin of Europe, with all its vanished glories, and of large parts of Asia glares in the eyes. When the designs of wicked men or the aggressive urge of mighty States dissolve over large areas the frame of civilised society, humble folk are confronted with difficulties with which they cannot cope. For them all is distorted, all is broken, even ground to pulp.

When I stand here this quiet afternoon I shudder to visualise what is actually happening to millions now and what is going to happen in this period when famine stalks the earth. None can compute what has been called "the unestimated sum of human pain." Our supreme task and duty is to guard the homes of the common people from the horrors and miseries of another war. We are all agreed on that.

Our American military colleagues, after having proclaimed their "over-all strategic concept" and computed available resources, always proceed to the next step—namely, the method. Here again there is widespread agreement. A world organization has already been erected for the prime purpose of preventing war, UNO, the successor of the League of Nations, with the decisive addition of the United States and all that that means, is already at work. We must make sure that its work is fruitful, that it is a reality and not a sham, that it is a force for action, and not merely a frothing of words, that it is a true temple of peace in which the shields of many nations can some day be hung up, and not merely a cockpit in a Tower of Babel. Before we cast away the solid assurances of national armaments for self-preservation we must be certain that our temple is built, not upon shifting sands or quagmires, but upon the rock. Anyone can see with his eyes open that our path will be difficult and also long, but if we persevere together as we did in the two world wars—though not, alas, in the interval between them—I cannot doubt that we shall achieve our common purpose in the end.

I have, however, a definite and practical proposal to make for action. Courts and magistrates may be set up but they cannot function without sheriffs and constables. The United Nations organization must immediately begin to be equipped with an international armed force. In such a matter we

can only go step by step, but we must begin now. I propose that each of the Powers and States should be invited to delegate a certain number of air squadrons to the service of the world organization. These squadrons would be trained and prepared in their own countries, but would move around in rotation from one country to another. They would wear the uniform of their own countries but with different badges. They would not be required to act against their own nation, but in other respects they would be directed by the world organization. This might be started on a modest scale and would grow as confidence grew. I wished to see this done after the first world war, and I devoutly trust it may be done forthwith.

It would nevertheless be wrong and imprudent to entrust the secret knowledge or experience of the atomic bomb, which the United States, Great Britain, and Canada now share, to the world organization, while it is still in its infancy. It would be criminal madness to cast it adrift in this still agitated and un-united world. No one in any country has slept less well in their beds because this knowledge and the method and the raw materials to apply it, are at present largely retained in American hands. I do not believe we should all have slept so soundly had the positions been reversed and if some Communist or neo-Fascist State monopolised for the time being these dread agencies. The fear of them alone might easily have been used to enforce totalitarian systems upon the free democratic world, with consequences appalling to human imagination. God has willed that this shall not be and we have at least a breathing space to set our house in order before this peril has to be encountered; and even then, if no effort is spared, we should still possess so formidable a superiority as to impose effective deterrents upon its employment, or threat of employment, by others. Ultimately, when the essential brotherhood of man is truly embodied and expressed in a world organization with all the necessary practical safeguards to make it effective, these powers would naturally be confided to that world organization.

Now I come to the second danger of these two marauders which threatens the cottage, the home, and the ordinary people—namely, tyranny. We cannot be blind to the fact that the liberties enjoyed by individual citizens throughout the British Empire are not valid in a considerable number of countries, some of which are very powerful. In these States control is enforced upon the common people by various kinds of all-embracing police governments. The power of the State is exercised without restraint, either by dictators or by compact oligarchies operating through a privileged party and a political police. It is not our duty at this time when difficulties are so numerous to interfere forcibly in the internal affairs of countries which we have not conquered in war. But we must never cease to proclaim in fearless tones the great principles of freedom and the rights of man which are the joint inheritance of the English-speaking world and which through Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the Habeas Corpus, trial by jury, and the English common law find their most famous expression in the American Declaration of Independence.

All this means that the people of any country have the right, and should have the power by constitutional action, by free unfettered elections, with secret ballot, to choose or change the character or form of government under which they dwell; that freedom of speech and thought should reign;

that courts of justice, independent of the executive, unbiased by any party, should administer laws which have received the broad assent of large majorities or are consecrated by time and custom. Here are the title deeds of freedom which should lie in every cottage home. Here is the message of the British and American peoples to mankind. Let us preach what we practise—let us practise what we preach.

I have now stated the two great dangers which menace the homes of the people: War and Tyranny. I have not yet spoken of poverty and privation which are in many cases the prevailing anxiety. But if the dangers of war and tyranny are removed, there is no doubt that science and co-operation can bring in the next few years to the world, certainly in the next few decades newly taught in the sharpening school of war, an expansion of material well-being beyond anything that has yet occurred in human experience. Now, at this sad and breathless moment, we are plunged in the hunger and distress which are the aftermath of our stupendous struggle; but this will pass and may pass quickly, and there is no reason except human folly or sub-human crime which should deny to all the nations the inauguration and enjoyment of an age of plenty. I have often used words which I learned fifty years ago from a great Irish-American orator, a friend of mine, Mr. Bourke Cockran. "There is enough for all. The earth is a generous mother; she will provide in plentiful abundance food for all her children if they will but cultivate her soil in justice and in peace." So far I feel that we are in full agreement.

Now, while still pursuing the method of realising our overall strategic concept, I come to the crux of what I have traveled here to say. Neither the sure prevention of war, nor the continuous rise of world organization will be gained without what I have called the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples. This means a special relationship between the British Commonwealth and Empire and the United States. This is no time for generalities, and I will venture to be precise. Fraternal association requires not only the growing friendship and mutual understanding between our two vast but kindred systems of society, but the continuance of the intimate relationship between our military advisers, leading to common study of potential dangers, the similarity of weapons and manuals of instructions, and to the interchange of officers and cadets at technical colleges. It should carry with it the continuance of the present facilities for mutual security by the joint use of all Naval and Air Force bases in the possession of either country all over the world. This would perhaps double the mobility of the American Navy and Air Force. It would greatly expand that of the British Empire Forces and it might well lead, if and as the world calms down, to important financial savings. Already we use together a large number of islands; more may well be entrusted to our joint care in the near future.

The United States has already a Permanent Defence Agreement with the Dominion of Canada, which is so devotedly attached to the British Commonwealth and Empire. This Agreement is more effective than many of those which have often been made under formal alliances. This principle should be extended to all British Commonwealths with full reciprocity. Thus, whatever happens, and thus only, shall we be secure ourselves and able to work together for the high and simple causes that are dear to us and bode no ill to any. Eventually there may come—I feel

eventually there will come—the principle of common citizenship, but that we may be content to leave to destiny, whose outstretched arm many of us can already clearly see.

There is however an important question we must ask ourselves. Would a special relationship between the United States and the British Commonwealth be inconsistent with our over-riding loyalties to the World Organization? I reply that, on the contrary, it is probably the only means by which that organization will achieve its full stature and strength. There are already the special United States relations with Canada which I have just mentioned, and there are the special relations between the United States and the South American Republics. We British have our twenty years Treaty of Collaboration and Mutual Assistance with Soviet Russia. I agree with Mr. Bevin, the Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, that it might well be a fifty years Treaty so far as we are concerned. We aim at nothing but mutual assistance and collaboration. The British have an alliance with Portugal unbroken since 1384, and which produced fruitful results at critical moments in the late war. None of these clash with the general interest of a world agreement, or a world organization; on the contrary they help it. "In my father's house are many mansions." Special associations between members of the United Nations which have no aggressive point against any other country, which harbour no design incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, far from being harmful, are beneficial and, as I believe, indispensable.

I spoke earlier of the Temple of Peace. Workmen from all countries must build that temple. If two of the workmen know each other particularly well and are old friends, if their families are inter-mingled, and if they have "faith in each other's purpose, hope in each other's future and charity towards each other's shortcomings"—to quote some good words I read here the other day—why cannot they work together at the common task as friends and partners? Why cannot they share their tools and thus increase each other's working powers? Indeed they must do so or else the temple may not be built, or, being built, it may collapse, and we shall all be proved again unteachable and have to go and try to learn again for a third time in a school of war, incomparably more rigorous than that from which we have just been released. The dark ages may return, the Stone Age may return on the gleaming wings of science, and what might now shower immeasurable material blessings upon mankind, may even bring about its total destruction. Beware, I say; time may be short. Do not let us take the course of allowing events to drift along until it is too late. If there is to be a fraternal association of the kind I have described, with all the extra strength and security which both our countries can derive from it, let us make sure that that great fact is known to the world, and that it plays its part in steadying and stabilizing the foundations of peace. There is the path of wisdom. Prevention is better than cure.

A shadow has fallen upon the scenes so lately lighted by the Allied victory. Nobody knows what Soviet Russia and its Communist international organization intends to do in the immediate future, or what are the limits, if any, to their expansive and proselytizing tendencies. I have a strong admiration and regard for the valiant Russian people and for my wartime comrade, Marshal Stalin. There is deep sympathy and goodwill in Britain—and I doubt not here also—to-

wards the peoples of all the Russias and a resolve to persevere through many differences and rebuffs in establishing lasting friendships. We understand the Russian need to be secure on her western frontiers by the removal of all possibility of German aggression. We welcome Russia to her rightful place among the leading nations of the world. We welcome her flag upon the seas. Above all, we welcome constant, frequent and growing contacts between the Russian people and our own people on both sides of the Atlantic. It is my duty however, for I am sure you would wish me to state the facts as I see them to you, to place before you certain facts about the present position in Europe.

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest and Sofia, all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in what I must call the Soviet sphere, and all are subject in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and, in many cases, increasing measure of control from Moscow. Athens alone—Greece with its immortal glories—is free to decide its future at an election under British, American and French observation. The Russian-dominated Polish Government has been encouraged to make enormous and wrongful inroads upon Germany, and mass expulsions of millions of Germans on a scale grievous and undreamed-of are now taking place. The Communist parties, which were very small in all these Eastern States of Europe, have been raised to pre-eminence and power far beyond their numbers and are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control. Police governments are prevailing in nearly every case, and so far, except in Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy.

Turkey and Persia are both profoundly alarmed and disturbed at the claims which are being made upon them and at the pressure being exerted by the Moscow Government. An attempt is being made by the Russians in Berlin to build up a quasi-Communist party in their zone of Occupied Germany by showing special favours to groups of left-wing German leaders. At the end of the fighting last June, the American and British Armies withdrew westwards, in accordance with an earlier agreement to a depth at some points of 150 miles upon a front of nearly four hundred miles, in order to allow our Russian allies to occupy this vast expanse of territory which the Western Democracies had conquered.

If now the Soviet Government tries, by separate action, to build up a pro-Communist Germany in their areas, this will cause new serious difficulties in the British and American zones, and will give the defeated Germans the power of putting themselves up to auction between the Soviets and the Western Democracies. Whatever conclusions may be drawn from these facts—and facts they are—this is certainly not the Liberated Europe we fought to build up. Nor is it one which contains the essentials of permanent peace.

The safety of the world requires a new unity in Europe, from which no nation should be permanently outcast. It is from the quarrels of the strong parent races in Europe that the world wars we have witnessed, or which occurred in former times, have sprung. Twice in our own lifetime we have seen the United States, against their wishes

and their traditions, against arguments, the force of which it is impossible not to comprehend, drawn by irresistible forces, into these wars in time to secure the victory of the good cause, but only after frightful slaughter and devastation had occurred. Twice the United States has had to send several million of its young men across the Atlantic to find the war; but now war can find any nation, wherever it may dwell between dusk and dawn. Surely we should work with conscious purpose for a grand pacification of Europe, within the structure of the United Nations and in accordance with its Charter. That I feel is an open cause of policy of very great importance.

In front of the iron curtain which lies across Europe are other causes for anxiety. In Italy the Communist Party is seriously hampered by having to support the Communist-trained Marshal Tito's claims to former Italian territory at the head of the Adriatic. Nevertheless the future of Italy hangs in the balance. Again one cannot imagine a regenerated Europe without a strong France. All my public life I have worked for a strong France and I never lost faith in her destiny, even in the darkest hours. I will not lose faith now. However, in a great number of countries, far from the Russian frontiers and throughout the world, Communist fifth columns are established and work in complete unity and absolute obedience to the directions they receive from the Communist center. Except in the British Commonwealth and in the United States where Communism is in its infancy, the Communist parties or fifth columns constitute a growing challenge and peril to Christian civilization. These are somber facts for anyone to have to recite on the narrow of a victory gained by so much splendid comradeship in arms and in the cause of freedom and democracy; but we should be most unwise not to face them squarely while time remains.

The outlook is also anxious in the Far East and especially in Manchuria. The Agreement which was made at Yalta, to which I was a party, was extremely favourable to Soviet Russia, but it was made at a time when no one could say that the German war might not extend all through the summer and autumn of 1945 and when the Japanese war was expected to last for a further 18 months from the end of the German war. In this country you are all so well informed about the Far East, and such devoted friends of China, that I do not need to expatiate on the situation there.

I have felt bound to portray the shadow which, alike in the west and in the east, falls upon the world. I was a high minister at the time of the Versailles Treaty and a close friend of Mr. Lloyd-George, who was the head of the British delegation at Versailles. I did not myself agree with many things that were done, but I have a very strong impression in my mind of that situation, and I find it painful to contrast it with that which prevails now. In those days there were high hopes and unbounded confidence that the wars were over, and that the League of Nations would become all-powerful. I do not see or feel that same confidence or even the same hopes in the haggard world at the present time.

On the other hand I repulse the idea that a new war is inevitable; still more that it is imminent. It is because I am sure that our fortunes are still in our own hands and that we hold the power to save the future, that I feel the duty to speak out now that I have the occasion and the opportunity to do so. I

do not believe that Soviet Russia desires war. What they desire is the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines. But what we have to consider here today while time remains, is the permanent prevention of war and the establishment of conditions of freedom and democracy as rapidly as possible in all countries. Our difficulties and dangers will not be removed by closing our eyes to them. They will not be removed by mere waiting to see what happens; nor will they be removed by a policy of appeasement. What is needed is a settlement, and the longer this is delayed, the more difficult it will be and the greater our dangers will become.

From what I have seen of our Russian friends and Allies during the war, I am convinced that there is nothing they admire so much as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than for weakness, especially military weakness. For that reason the old doctrine of a balance of power is unsound. We cannot afford, if we can help it, to work on narrow margins, offering temptations to a trial of strength. If the Western Democracies stand together in strict adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter, their influence for furthering those principles will be immense and no one is likely to molest them. If however they become divided or falter in their duty and if these all-important years are allowed to slip away then indeed catastrophe may overwhelm us all.

Last time I saw it all coming and cried aloud to my own fellow-countrymen and to the world, but no one paid any attention. Up till the year 1933 or even 1935, Germany might have been saved from the awful fate which has overtaken her and we might all have been spared the miseries Hitler let loose upon mankind. There never was a war in all history easier to prevent by timely action than the one which has just desolated such great areas of the globe. It could have been prevented in my belief without the firing of a single shot, and Germany might be powerful, prosperous and honoured today; but no one would listen and one by one we were all sucked into the awful whirlpool. We surely must not let that happen again. This can only be achieved by reaching now, in 1946, a good understanding on all points with Russia under the general authority of the United Nations Organization and by the maintenance of that good understanding through many peaceful years, by the world instrument, supported by the whole strength of the English-speaking world and all its connections. There is the solution which I respectfully offer to you in this Address to which I have given the title "The Sinews of Peace."

Let no man underrate the abiding power of the British Empire and Commonwealth. Because you see the 46 millions in our island harassed about their food supply, of which they only grow one half, even in war-time, or because we have difficulty in restarting our industries and export trade after six years of passionate war effort, do not suppose that we shall not come through these dark years of privation as we have come through the glorious years of agony, or that half a century from now, you will not see 70 or 80 millions of Britons spread about the world and united in defense of our traditions, our way of life, and of the world causes which you and we espouse. If the population of the English-speaking Commonwealths be added to that of the United States with all that such cooperation implies in the air, on the sea, all over the globe and in science and in industry, and

in moral force, there will be no quivering, precarious balance of power to offer its temptation to ambition or adventure. On the contrary, there will be an overwhelming assurance of security. If we adhere faithfully to the Charter of the United Nations and walk forward in sedate and sober strength seeking no one's land or treasure, seeking to lay no arbitrary control upon the thoughts of men; if all British moral and material forces and convictions are joined with your own in fraternal association, the high-roads of the future will be clear, not only for us but for all, not only for our time, but for a century to come.

THE RIVER OF TIME AND THE IMPERATIVE OF ACTION

(By Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev)

I

Here we stand, before a sculpture in which the sculptor's imagination and fantasy, with remarkable expressiveness and laconism, convey the drama of the "Cold War," the irrepressible human striving to penetrate the barriers of alienation and confrontation. It is symbolic that this artist was the granddaughter of Winston Churchill and that this sculpture should be in Fulton.

More than 46 years ago Winston Churchill spoke in Fulton and in my country this speech was singled out as the formal declaration of the "Cold War." This was indeed the first time the words, "Iron Curtain," were pronounced, and the whole Western World was challenged to close ranks against the threat of tyranny in the form of the Soviet Union and Communist expansion. Everything else in this speech, including Churchill's analysis of the postwar situation in the world, his thoughts about the possibility of preventing a third world war, the prospects for progress, and methods of reconstructing the postwar world, remained unknown to the Soviet people.

Today, in paying tribute to this prominent statesman, we can evaluate more quietly and objectively both the merits of his speech and the limitations of the analysis which it included, his ideas and predictions, and his strategic principles.

Since that time the world in which we live has undergone tremendous changes. Even so, however paradoxical it may sound, there is a certain similarity between the situation then and today. Then, the prewar structure of international relations had virtually collapsed, a new pattern of forces had emerged along with a new set of interests and claims.

Different trends in world development could be discerned, but their prospects were not clearly outlined. New possibilities for progress had appeared. Answers had to be found to the challenges posed by new subjects of international law. The atmosphere was heavy—not only with hope, but also with suspicion, lack of understanding, unpredictability.

In other words, a situation had emerged in which a decision with universal implications had to be taken. Churchill's greatness is seen in the fact that he was the first among leading political figures to understand that.

Indeed, the world community which had at this time already established the United Nations, was faced with a unique opportunity to change the course of world development, fundamentally altering the role in it of force and of war. And, of course, this depended to a decisive degree on the Soviet Union and the United States—here I hardly need to explain why.

So I would like to commence my remarks by noting that the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.

missed that chance—the chance to establish their relationship on a new basis of principle and thereby to initiate a world order different from that which existed before the war. I think it is clear that I am not suggesting that they should have established a sort of condominium over the rest of the world. The opportunity was on a different plane altogether.

If the United States and the Soviet Union had been capable of understanding their responsibility and sensibly correlating their national interests and strivings with the rights and interests of other states and peoples, the planet today would be a much more suitable and favorable place for human life. I have more than once criticized the foreign policy of the Stalinist leadership in those years. Not only was it incapable of reevaluating the historical logic of the interwar period, taking into account the experience and results of the war, and following a course which corresponded to the changed reality, it committed a major error in equating the victory of democracy over fascism with the victory of socialism and aiming to spread socialism throughout the world.

But the West, and the United States in particular, also committed an error. Its conclusion about the probability of open Soviet military aggression was unrealistic and dangerous. This could never have happened, not only because Stalin, as in 1939–1941, was afraid of war, did not want war, and never would have engaged in a major war. But primarily because the country was exhausted and destroyed; it had lost tens of millions of people, and the public hated war. Having won a victory, the army and the soldiers were dying to get home and get back to a normal life.

By including the "nuclear component" in world politics, and on this basis unleashing a monstrous arms race—and here the initiator was the United States, the West—"defense sufficiency was exceeded," as the lawyers say. This was a fateful error.

So I would be so bold as to affirm that the governing circles of the victorious powers lacked an adequate strategic vision of the possibilities for world development as they emerged after the war—and, consequently, a true understanding of their own countries' national interests. Hiding behind slogans of "love for peace" and defense of their people's interests, on both sides decisions were taken which split asunder the world which had just succeeded in overcoming fascism because it was united.

And on both sides this was justified ideologically. The conflict was presented as the inevitable opposition between good and evil—all the evil, of course, being attributed to the opponent. This continued for decades until it became evident that we were approaching the abyss. I am stating this because the world community has paid dearly for the errors committed at this turning-point in world history.

In the major centers of world politics the choice, it would seem, has today been made in favor of peace, cooperation, interaction, and overall security. And in pushing forward to a new civilization we should under no circumstances again make the intellectual, and consequently political, error of interpreting victory in the "Cold War" narrowly as a victory for oneself, one's own way of life, for one's own values and merits. This was a victory over a scheme for the development of humanity which was becoming slowly congealed and leading us to destruction. It was a shattering of the vicious circle into which we had driven ourselves. This was al-

together a victory for common sense, reason, democracy, and common human values.

II

Churchill urged us to think "super-strategically," meaning by this the capacity to rise above the subsidiary problems and particularities of current realities, focusing on the major trends and being guided by them.

What are the characteristics of the world situation today? In thinking over the processes which we ourselves have witnessed, we are forced to conclude that humanity is at a major turning-point. Not only the peoples of the former U.S.S.R., but the whole world is living through this watershed situation. This is not just some ordinary stage of development, like many others in world history. This is a turning-point on a historic and worldwide scale and signifies the incipient substitution of one paradigm of civilization by another.

Since antiquity the progress of humanity has occurred within the framework of regional civilizations and relatively autonomous societies—autonomous in the sense that the interaction among them was not the determining factor in the development of a given state or a given people and did not turn into an all-encompassing interdependence. Before our eyes this pattern of relations is receding into the past. It is being overtaken by powerful global integrating trends due to the far-reaching scientific and technical revolution, the internationalization of economic processes, and the profound transformation of the conditions of human life.

All of this allows us to conclude that there has been a radical change in the very forms of social development which existed in the past—a change in the organization of social life and in virtually every area of human existence. What is more, there has been a change in people's internal world, in how they visualize moral values and social ideals.

These changes, of course, did not start today or yesterday. But it is today, before our eyes and with our participation, that they enter their decisive, watershed phase, when all spheres of human activity—production, economics, finance, the market, politics, science, culture and the like—become integrated on a world-wide scale. This existing and intensifying integration of the world reveals a broad spectrum of favorable opportunities for the future of mankind.

First and foremost, it signifies the possibility of creating a global international security system, thus preventing large-scale military conflicts like the world wars of the 20th century and facilitating a radical reduction in levels of armaments and reducing the burden of military expenditures. This signifies that the attention, and the resources, of the world community can be focussed on solving problems in non-military areas: demography, ecology, food production, energy sources, and the like. This means new opportunities for economic progress, ensuring normal conditions of life for the Earth's growing population and improved living conditions.

We have, in fact, already started moving in that direction. But the significance of these changes, while a great source of hope, should not blind us to the dangers—some of which we have already encountered. It would be a supreme tragedy if the world, having overcome the "1946 model," were to find itself once again in a "1914 model" world. A major international effort will be needed to render irreversible the shift in favor of a democratic world—and democratic for the whole of humanity, not just for half of it.

I am in full agreement with Secretary of State James Baker's formulation. The existing dangers are largely a function of the watershed character of the times we live in. It is quite clear that the enhanced integration and interdependence of the world at the same time creates new tensions—both domestically and internationally—unleashing processes which earlier were hidden from view. The very fact that the two world blocks are no longer in confrontation and that the collapse of totalitarian regimes has released centrifugal forces which had been temporarily frozen—territorial and intergovernmental contradictions and claims—has encouraged an exaggerated nationalism. And this has already led to much bloodshed.

The ending of the global confrontation of nuclear superpowers, and of the ideological opposition between the two world systems, has rendered even more visible today's major contradiction—between the rich and poor countries, between "North" and "South". All these terms today are not merely conventional.

The essence of the situation is not altered by the fact that several countries of the "South" have shaken off poverty and backwardness, while some are treading on the heels of the old developed countries. Still the correlation between poverty and wealth in the modern world has not improved, but has actually deteriorated due to the profound crisis in the countries which have emerged from the USSR. The situation is made worse by the headlong development of world communications and the systematic transmission of information, inculcating in the less developed countries a more intense feeling of social deprivation and even of hopelessness and despair.

Turning now to the world economy, the increasingly close links between national economies and markets is accompanied by intensified international competition, leading to de facto trade wars and a threatened rebirth of protectionism. One of the worst of the new dangers is ecological. When Winston Churchill gave his speech here, most people on this planet did not even suspect a mortal threat from that direction.

But today, global climatic shifts, the greenhouse effect, the "ozone hole," acid rain, contamination of the atmosphere, soil, and water by industrial and household waste, the destruction of the forests, etc., all threaten the stability of the planet. Despite all the efforts being made to prevent ecological catastrophe, the destruction of nature is intensifying. And the effects of our poisoning of the spiritual sphere—drug addiction, alcoholism, terrorism, crime—become further ecological threats. All of this together heightens the probability of social, national, and international conflicts.

Not having understood the transitional character of the present international system, with all its inherent contradictions and conflicts, politicians again risk committing errors which would have the most baneful consequences for all. The prospect of catastrophic climatic changes, more frequent droughts, floods, hunger, epidemics, national-ethnic conflicts, and other similar catastrophes compels governments to adopt a world perspective and seek generally applicable solutions. The only alternative would be an intensification of conflicts throughout the world, instability of political systems, civil wars, i.e., ultimately, a threat to world peace.

This means that we need another understanding of the problems of international security, of national interest, and of the tasks

which must be solved to guarantee the survival of humanity. We must explore various scenarios, including the most unfavorable, predicting their occurrence so as to be able to act accordingly. Some experience already exists in various areas: the Persian Gulf, Yugoslavia, Cambodia, Korea, the Caucasus, the Baltic region, the earthquake in Armenia, the Chernobyl disaster. What is important is that all these varied undertakings by the world community bear the imprint of the new atmosphere in the world, one which emerged, among other reasons, thanks to Perestroika and the New Thinking.

One consequence of increasing world integration is the democratization of international relations. It would seem that all are agreed that the bipolar system has exhausted its potential. The view exists that it will be replaced by a monocentric one. But most people feel that the world will be multipolar. This would probably be acceptable if, of course, one bears in mind that this is not the type of redistribution of roles which was customary in the past.

No, the principle according to which certain states or groups of states could monopolize the international arena is no longer valid. What is emerging is a more complex global structure of international relations. An awareness of the need for some kind of global government is gaining ground, one in which all members of the world community would take part. Events should not be allowed to develop spontaneously. There must be an adequate response to global changes and challenges. If we are to eliminate force and prevent conflicts from developing into a worldwide conflagration, we must seek means of collective action by the world community.

There are chances for peace. This is confirmed by what has happened to the political views of the leaders of the Great Powers in the past few years. What is needed are principles and mechanisms for converting possibility into reality. The principles are generally known. I spoke of them in New York at the United Nations General Assembly in the end of 1988.

III

What has to be done is to create the necessary mechanisms? In my position it is not very appropriate to give them names. It is important that they should be authorized by the world community to deal with problems. Without that there is no point in talking about a new era or a new civilization. I will limit myself to designating the lines of activity and the competence of such mechanisms.

Nuclear and chemical weapons. Rigid controls must be instituted to prevent their dissemination, including measures of compulsion in cases of violation. An agreement must be concluded between all presently nuclear states on procedures for cutting back on such weapons and liquidating them. Finally a world convention on chemical weapons should be signed.

The peaceful use of nuclear energy. The powers of the IAEA must be strengthened, and it is imperative that all countries working in this area be included in the IAEA system. The procedures of the IAEA should be tightened up and the work performed in a more open and aboveboard manner. Under United Nations auspices a powerful consortium should be created to finance the modernization or liquidation of highly risky nuclear power stations, and also to store spent fuel. A set of world standards for nuclear power plants should be established. Work on nuclear fusion must be expanded and intensified.

The export of conventional weapons. Governmental exports of such weapons should be ended by the year 2000, and, in regions of armed conflict, it should be curtailed at once. The illegal trade in such arms must be equated with international terrorism and the drug trade. With respect to these questions the intelligence services of the states which are permanent members of the Security Council should be coordinated. And the Security Council itself must be slightly expanded, which I will mention in a moment.

Regional conflicts. Considering the impartially examined experience obtained in the Middle East, in Africa, in Southeast Asia, Korea, Yugoslavia, the Caucasus, and Afghanistan, a special body should be set up under the United Nations Security Council with the right to employ political, diplomatic, economic, and military means to settle and prevent such conflicts.

Human rights. The European process has officially recognized the universality of this common human value, i.e., the acceptability of international interference wherever human rights are being violated. This task is not easy even for states which signed the Paris Charter of 1990 and even less so for all states members of the United Nations. However, I believe that the new world order will not be fully realized unless the United Nations and its Security Council do not create structures (taking into consideration existing United Nations and regional structures) authorized to impose sanctions and to make use of other measures of compulsion.

Food, demography, economic assistance. It is no accident that these problems should be dealt with in this connection. Upon their solution depends the biological viability of the Earth's population and the minimal social stability needed for a civilized existence of states and peoples. Major scientific, financial, political, and public organizations—among them, the authoritative Club of Rome—have long been occupied with these problems. However, the newly emerging type of international interaction will make possible a breakthrough in our practical approach to them. I would propose that next year a world conference be held on this subject, one similar to the forthcoming ecological conference.

IV

Ladies and Gentlemen: All of these problems demand an enhanced level of organization of the international community. However, even now, at a time of sharply increased interdependence in the world, many countries are morbidly jealous of their sovereignty, and many peoples of their national independence and identity. This is one of the newest global contradictions, one which must be overcome by joint effort. That it can, in principle, be overcome can be seen from the experience of the European communities and, although still to only a slight degree, from the European process as a whole.

Here the decisive role may and must be played by the United Nations. Of course, it must be restructured, together with its component bodies, in order to be capable of confronting the new tasks. These ideas have long been under discussion, and many proposals have been put forward. I myself have no plan of my own for reorganizing the United Nations. I will just address the basic parameters of the changes which are ready for solution.

The United Nations, which emerged from the results and the lessons of the second World War, is still marked by the period of its creation. This is true both with respect to the makeup of its subsidiary bodies and aux-

iliary institutions and with respect to its functioning. Nothing, for instance, other than the division into victors and vanquished, explains why such countries as Germany and Japan do not figure among the permanent members of the Security Council.

In general, I feel Article 53 on "hostile states" should be immediately deleted from the UN Charter. Also, the criterion of possession of nuclear weapons would be archaic in the new era before us. The great country of India should be represented in the Security Council. The authority and potential of this Council would also be enhanced by incorporation on a permanent basis of Italy, Indonesia, Canada, Poland, Brazil, Mexico, and Egypt, even if initially they do not possess the veto.

The Security Council will require better support, more effective and more numerous peace-keeping forces. Under certain circumstances it will be desirable to put certain national armed forces at the disposal of the Security Council, making them subordinate to the United Nations military command.

The proposal, which I accept, has already been made that a global observation system be established for spotting emergencies. The United Nations Secretary-General should be authorized to put it into action even before a conflict becomes violent. Closer coordination of UN organs with regional structures would only enhance its capacity to settle disputes in the world.

Of course, the UN's contemporary role, and, first and foremost, an expanded and strengthened Security Council, will require substantial funding. The method adopted for financing at the founding of the United Nations revealed its weaknesses just as soon as, some years later, it became more active and came closer to actually carrying out the tasks assigned by its founders. This method must be supplemented by some mechanism tying the UN to the world economy.

My thoughts may, at first glance, appear somewhat unrealistic. But we will count on the fact that business is becoming more humane, that a powerful process of technical and political internationalization is taking place, and that business is achieving an increasingly organic relationship with contemporary world politics into which the seeds of the "new thinking" have been cast. Today democracy must prove that it can exist not only as the antithesis of totalitarianism. This means that it must move from the national arena to the international.

On today's agenda is not just a union of democratic states, but also a democratically organized world community. Thus, we live today in a watershed era. One epoch has ended, and a second is commencing. No one yet knows how concrete it will be. Having long been orthodox Marxists, we were sure we knew. But life once again refuted those who claimed to be know-it-alls and messiahs.

It is clear that the 20th century nurtured immense opportunities. And from it we are inheriting frightful, apocalyptic threats. But we have at our disposal a great science, one which will help us avoid crude miscalculations. Moral values have survived in this frightful century, and these will assist and support us in this, the most difficult, transition in the history of humanity—from one qualitative state to another.

In concluding I would like to return to my starting-point. From this tribune Churchill issued an appeal to the United Nations to rescue peace and progress, but primarily to Anglo-Saxon unity as the nucleus to which others could adhere. In the achievement of this goal the decisive role, in his view, was

to be played by force, above all, by armed force. He even entitled his speech the "Musculation of Peace."

The goal today has not changed: peace and progress for all. But now we have the capacity to approach it without paying the heavy price we have been paying these past 50 years or so, without having to resort to means, which put the very goal itself in doubt, which even constitute a threat to civilization. And while continuing to recognize the outstanding role of the United States of America, and today of other rich and highly developed countries, we must not limit our appeal to the elect, but call upon the whole world community.

In a qualitatively new and different world situation the overwhelming majority of the United Nations will, I hope, be capable of organizing themselves and acting in concert on the principles of democracy, equality of rights, balance of interests, common sense, freedom of choice, and willingness to cooperate. Made wise by bitter experience, they will, I think, be capable of dispensing, when necessary, with egoistic considerations in order to arrive at the exalted goal which is man's destiny on earth.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that the Churchill speech of 1946, I believe, defined the world in which we have lived ever since, a world of superpower confrontation and classic competition between two very competitive systems of government and of economics.

I think that we all know that the cold war is now over and that we won. Mr. Gorbachev yesterday made some note of that fact.

I think his speech should bear extensive analysis before we pass judgment on it, but I think it was, indeed, a major speech and one that will be dissected, should be dissected, should be considered into the weeks and months ahead as we all look to the establishment of new structures in the world.

Just as Mr. Churchill's speech in 1946 had great bearing on the ensuing 45 years, I think the speech of Mr. Gorbachev yesterday will have some extensive bearing on the years that lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD at this point today's article from the New York Times titled "At Site of 'Iron Curtain' Speech, Gorbachev Buries the Cold War."

This is an article that compares the two speeches and describes the setting of the stage as to why Churchill came to Westminster and why Gorbachev came to Westminster.

I do all of this because I think Members would like the opportunity to read both speeches and to understand the significance and the importance of these two historic addresses.

AT SITE OF "IRON CURTAIN" SPEECH,
GORBACHEV BURIES COLD WAR

(By Francis X. Clines)

FULTON, MO.—History came full cycle today as Mikhail S. Gorbachev added a postscript of global reconciliation to the "Iron Curtain" speech by Winston Churchill here 46 years ago, but pointedly contended that the United States was the "initiator" of the nuclear arms race.

Speaking at Westminster College, the scene of Churchill's warning in 1946 about Soviet imperialism, the former Soviet leader conceded the Kremlin's "major error" in equating the defeat of fascism in World War II with the inevitable triumph of Communism.

But he argued that the United States and other Western nations erred grievously in failing to realize that Stalin and the Soviet people were too exhausted from the war ever to indulge in fresh military aggression against the West.

"By including the 'nuclear component' in world politics, and on this basis unleashing a monstrous arms race—and here the initiator was the United States, the West—defense sufficiency was exceeded," as the lawyers say," Mr. Gorbachev declared. "This was a fateful error." [Excerpts, page A14.]

Speaking as the last President of the now defunct Soviet Union and the Kremlin leader who led the world back from nuclear confrontation, Mr. Gorbachev spent most of his speech looking ahead to a better world strengthened through his prescriptions for a stronger United Nations.

But he also presented a blunt critique of some cherished American underpinnings of the cold war and warned against "the intellectual, and consequently political error, of interpreting victory in the cold war narrowly as a victory for oneself."

Rather than a lopsided victory, Mr. Gorbachev described the end of the cold war as "a shattering of the vicious circle into which we had driven ourselves."

"This was altogether a victory for common sense, reason, democracy, and common human values," he said.

Examining the roots of the cold war, Mr. Gorbachev cited a critical Soviet error in Stalin's inability to grasp post-war politics. But he contended that "the West, and the United States in particular, also committed an error."

"Its conclusion about the probability of open Soviet military aggression was unrealistic and dangerous," he said, differing with the basis of the West's collective defensive strategy of the postwar decades.

"This could never have happened, not only because Stalin, as in 1939-41, was afraid of war, did not want war, and never would have engaged in a major war," he contended. "But primarily because the country was exhausted and destroyed."

Visiting, like Churchill, as a politician finally rebuffed at home but still outspoken in retirement, Mr. Gorbachev spoke to an outdoor gathering and offered a range of proposals for strengthening the United Nations, including the enlargement of the Security Council and the application of stronger sanctions and military force against wayward members.

But the audience, watching him on a sunny day in a simple American heartland setting, was clearly more interested in his pronouncements of the end of the cold war *** Mr. Gorbachev was reflective and recanted a bit on his own. "Having long been orthodox Marxists, we were sure we knew," he said. "But life once again refuted those who claimed to be know-it-alls and messiahs."

A 'WATERSHED' MOMENT

Mr. Gorbachev's speech was titled "The River of Time and the Imperative of Action," an allusion to his sense that a "watershed" moment had arrived, comparable in its way to the 1946 moment and its need for concerted action. He was applauded repeatedly, particularly in hailing the world's retreat from the abyss, urging global efforts to pro-

tect the ecology and warning against triumphalist claims of cold war victory.

The Missouri countryside glistened, with a cluster of cold war nuclear missile silos all but forgotten hundreds of miles to the west. Mr. Gorbachev obviously enjoyed the day, offering Churchill's V for victory hand signal to pleading photographers and giving thanks for a lunch of baked ham and potato salad to the administrators of the 140-year-old liberal arts college of 750 undergraduates.

As in earlier speeches, Mr. Gorbachev warned against the excesses of nationalism reawakened at the end of the cold war, as well as against a "monocentric" view of post-cold-war politics in which one dominant nation, the United States, might prevail over a "multipolar" political world.

He was cheered as he arrived in the sunshine at the speaking platform set before a sculpture by Edwina Sandys, Churchill's granddaughter, celebrating the fall of the Berlin wall. He came as a pensioned politician looking for a foothold in the West on a fund-raising tour for his new Gorbachev Foundation. He spoke gratis and beamed and touched his chest to demonstrate his gratitude as a crowd estimated at 10,000 applauded the college's awarding of an honorary doctor of laws to him.

STRONGER U.N. URGED

The mood in Fulton was serene, considerably less ominous than the one conjured by Churchill.

"A shadow has fallen upon the scenes so lately lighted by the Allied victory," Churchill had declared here on March 5, 1946. "From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic an iron curtain has descended across the Continent."

Mr. Gorbachev stood in the Missouri sunshine to proclaim an end to Churchill's alarum, but also to press for a far more strengthened United Nations to deal with the complicated post-Soviet world. In particular, he called for creation of a "special body" to use economic and military means to prevent regional conflicts and for a greatly enlarged Security Council, with such nations as India, Japan, Poland, Mexico, Germany, Brazil, Canada, Indonesia and Egypt as member, even without veto power.

Churchill had declared here, "Nobody knows what Soviet Russia and its Communist international organization intends to do in the immediate future, or what are the limits, if any, to their expansive and proselytizing tendencies."

Today, Mr. Gorbachev stood at the same lectern as Churchill to symbolize the Soviet Union's peaceful demise and look no less uncertainly into the future, hoping this time that nations "made wise by bitter experience" might cast aside "egoistic considerations in order to arrive at the exalted goal which is man's destiny on earth."

PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, what do football coach Knute Rockne, Walt Whitman, Charles Lindbergh, Washington Irving, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and James Thurber have in common? In addition to being distinguished Americans, each was once a public employee. I believe our public employees today

continue to distinguish themselves professionally and personally, and I am honored to participate in this special order for Public Service Recognition Week.

From the firefighters who protect our lives and property, to the customs agents fighting the distribution of illicit drugs in our country, to the teachers who help educate our children, the scientists who are working to create safer products and a safer environment for our families, public employees impact our lives in so many ways, but, often, receive little praise or attention for their work. That is wrong, and public service recognition week is an attempt to give all of our public employees the praise, attention, and respect they deserve. Not only from their employers in the administration or in the State and local governments, but from Congress and the American people.

In recognizing our public employees, we are also recognizing the extraordinary work they do. We are recognizing the effort of Neil Armstrong, a public employee, who was the first person on Earth to set foot on the Moon. We are recognizing the efforts of our scientists in the Agriculture Department who created flame-retardant clothing for firefighters. We are acknowledging the important work of Clara Barton, a public employee with the United States Patent Office, who created the American Red Cross. We are recognizing the work of our local government workers who inoculate our children and have helped almost completely wipe out polio and measles. We are giving thanks to our Armed Forces who protect this country with their lives, and who achieved such a stunning victory in Desert Storm. We thank the Naval Research Laboratories who discovered Teflon and plastic wrap. We recognize the individual efforts of Government employees who invented the plastic cornea, the CAT scan to measure brain waves and detect cancer, the first modern computer, the vaccine for meningitis and malaria, radar and sonar, and the bar code scanner now used in most supermarkets.

I could continue to list further contributions by our public sector, but we would be here all day.

□ 1540

Suffice it to say, our public servants impact almost every aspect of our lives. We are not only grateful for their work and professionalism, we are a better country for it.

Public employees were a critical component of our victory in Desert Storm, which I mentioned previously, and this Congress honored them for it. That was an event that we focused on as a Nation, and because we focused on it as a Nation, we saw the performance immediately before us on our television screens, on the front pages of

our newspapers and we heard it on the radio; but it is the day-to-day, the week-to-week, the month-to-month, and indeed the year-to-year performance of our public employees that enhances our lives.

We as policymakers are not doing as well as we ought to. The American public have evidenced that very forcefully. They have indicated in poll after poll that we are not doing the job that needs to be done to solve the critical problems confronting our country. I think they are right on that. I think they have a right to be angry about the failure of the Congress and the President and indeed other public bodies to act decisively and effectively to solve the problems of education, health care, and law enforcement, infrastructure, the environment, and energy. The list of issues that we need to address is a long one. But they should not and hopefully will not confuse the day-to-day and month-to-month performance of our public employees who perform their duties assigned to them with dispatch, with effectiveness, with high morale, with the failure of policymakers.

I have as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor-Health and Human Service-Education of the Committee on Appropriations and as a member of the Subcommittee on Treasury-Postal Service-General Government of the Committee on Appropriations asked, Mr. Speaker, almost every leader who has been brought in by either the Reagan administration or the Bush administration into government to oversee the various Departments of our executive side of the government. I have asked them to compare the performance of the public employees who they then supervised with those they supervised before.

Uniformly, Mr. Speaker, they have said that their talents, their morale, their commitment, their energy was equal and in many cases surpasses that which they found in the private sector.

So I am proud to rise in behalf of public employees and point out that a recognition week is not enough. Every day we need to remember the service they give to this country.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I just simply want to recognize the fact that this is National Employee Recognition Week. Mr. Speaker, we take the services of our Federal employees for granted. There is not one of us in this House of Representatives or in the Senate or in the United States whose life is not touched every single day by the services of a Federal employee.

Mr. Speaker, I am very fortunate because my district in Maryland is home to a great number of Federal employees and Federal agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Food and Drug Administration, Health and Human Services, Na-

tional Oceanographic and Atmospheric Agency, and a whole litany.

Mr. Speaker, we depend on NASA for things that we do, we depend on Social Security and all of the agencies that touch our lives.

We sometimes tend to forget those people who go to their jobs every day, who serve us in so many ways and help us as Members of Congress with our constituencies, too.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out today that it should not just be 1 week, it should not be just 1 day, it should be every day that we look to these human beings who have given their careers for public service.

In addition, it is a fact that they are not only involved in public service of their professions, but my experience has been that they are very generous with giving their time for community services.

In my area, as an example, many of them work during their own time in an organization called Inter-Generations, where the elderly are put together with very young people so they can combine the experience of old age with the excitement and wisdom of children, the joy of children.

They are involved in repairing houses, such as when we had Christmas in April just recently. They are involved in so many community service enterprises. Environmentally, they have done a lot of cleanup work.

But it is every day that these civil servants are there and they do in fact serve us. Money can be put into agencies, but if you do not have people running the agencies in a very diligent, committed manner, then we are not going to achieve that global competitiveness and the greatness that is America.

So, Mr. Speaker, I salute our Federal employees. I call it to the attention of this House that we really should recognize people who have devoted their lives to public service.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with the other members of the bipartisan Federal Government Service Task Force to commemorate Public Service Recognition Week, and to pay tribute to the 20 million Americans who do the essential work of our Nation.

As Grover Cleveland said, when he accepted the nomination for Governor of New York back in 1882:

Public officers are the servants and agents of the people, to execute the laws which the people have made.

And today, the American system of government is maintained by a public work force that serves us on all levels—Federal, State, and local.

This work force consists of managers, administrators, and workers in all functions of our government—from foreign service to internal revenue to Social Security. We are supported by teachers, firefighters, law enforcement personnel, postal workers, secretaries, health care workers, shipbuilders, Treasury workers, accountants, garbage collectors, engineers,

and claims representatives—to name a few. These folks perform a wide range of services which sustain the framework of our government.

Our public work force tackles our environmental challenges and safeguards and enhances our lives and communities. More than 2 million public employees guard our Nation through service in our Armed Forces. Nearly every child in America is educated by public school teachers, and 95 percent of our children entering school are vaccinated by public employees, protecting them against major disease.

Public Service Recognition Week will raise public awareness of these contributions by informing the public of the nature and value of the efforts of our public work force. It will also serve to boost the morale of these employees, as we acknowledge and show our appreciation for their work and give them the high profile that they deserve.

This week, over 1,000 cities across the country will participate in festivities honoring our public work force, as well as its veterans and retirees. Major activities are planned here in Washington, DC this weekend, where government agency employees will transform the National Mall into a who's who and what's what of government.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of the legislation designating May 4 through 10 of this year as Public Service Recognition Week, and would like to thank my colleagues, Congressman JIM MORAN and Senator PAUL SARBANES, for introducing this joint resolution. I would also like to acknowledge both the Public Employees Roundtable and the President's Council on Management Improvement for their sponsorship of this celebration.

I know that I speak for all of us here in Congress, and for all Americans, when I say that we truly appreciate the contributions that our public work force makes to our Nation.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to pay tribute to millions of frontline public servants who work every day with too little recognition.

Public Service Recognition Week can help revive the declining attractiveness of public service at a time when the public and private sectors are in a fierce competition for the available pool of talent. Paul Volcker's National Commission on Public Service warned of the quiet crisis public service faces as skilled senior employees leave government and talented young people shun public service. To compete, the Federal Government must become competitive. It must be willing to adopt the prescriptions it urges on the private sector—from full equal opportunity to greater efficiency.

The Federal sector must certainly become competitive with wages and benefits. The new entrepreneurial generation shops before it buys and too often it passes by the government. Today's talent pool knows that the competition for Federal employment today are more often IBM, Ford, and AT&T than the States and cities.

As the Member from the District of Columbia, I have an especially strong appreciation for the value and the importance of public service. The Federal Government is not only

the largest employer in the country, it is the largest in the District. Nearly 90,000 District residents work for the Federal Government and nearly 42,000 are retired from Federal Service.

We are proud to be a city of public service. The residents of the District of Columbia are our Nation's frontline public servants. Like public servants all over the country and at all levels of government, they are always there for us. We in the Congress must be there for them and for more like them.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in designating the week of May 4–10, 1992 as "Public Service Recognition Week." I commend Congressman MORAN for introducing House Joint Resolution 430 on behalf of the Federal Government Service Task Force, and thank all of the Members who supported this resolution which has been sent to the White House for the President's signature.

Mr. Speaker, Public Service Recognition Week is a part of the annual nationwide celebration honoring the 20 million public employees at the Federal, State, and local levels. This week presents us with an opportunity to thank public employees for their hard work in keeping our cities, States, and Nation running smoothly.

Many Federal, State, and local workers have made special contributions to our country. Government employees have discovered the AIDS virus, invented the first modern computer, developed the vaccine for meningitis, created flame-retardant clothing for firefighters, and contributed to countless other societal developments.

Perhaps even more importantly, we would be unable to function as a nation without the day-to-day dedication of public employees who teach our children, protect our environment, help keep our cities safe, ensure our national security, conduct health research, and perform numerous other vital tasks for people throughout the United States. I want to take this opportunity to especially thank the government workers in the San Francisco Bay area who make it such a great place in which to work and live.

Mr. Speaker, public employees merit recognition for their daily contributions to the well being of our communities, and I join Americans throughout our Nation in thanking them for making this a better and stronger nation.

THE SALE OF F-15 AIRCRAFT TO SAUDI ARABIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOSTMAYER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak for a few moments on the question of the proposed sale of F-15 aircraft by the United States to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Mr. Speaker, it was just barely over a year ago that the gulf war ended. When the gulf war ended, I made from this well suggestions that the United States, our Nation, should use this golden opportunity, this moment of respite, this hiatus, in order to install

and impose a total embargo on arms sales to that troubled region of the world.

I suggested that the arms embargo should extend not just to our enemies or to countries with which we have had a tenuous and difficult relationship, but to fervent friends and allies as well throughout the entire region.

A very famous American speaking just a few feet from where I am standing on March 6, 1991, again just a bit over a year ago, made a very important statement in which that famous American said these following words:

We must act to control the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the missiles used to deliver them. It would be tragic if the nations of the Middle East were now in the wake of war to embark on a new arms race.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, that famous American is our President, George Bush, who in March last year, signaling the end of the gulf war, stood on that rostrum and said those words, which I remember were reacted to by the general applause in this Chamber, and I am sure by all the viewing public in the United States and around the world, because it signaled a change of business.

But what has been the result in this year plus a month or so? Well, it has been business as usual, the arms business as usual, more of the same, increased, not decreased deliveries of weapons systems.

The United States, according to figures that I have seen, has in this year since the end of the gulf war sold at least \$15 billion worth of armaments to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Now the President, Mr. Speaker, is on the verge of sending up to the Hill for our approval or disapproval a request for the sale of 72 F-15 aircraft, again to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a particularly inopportune, untimely, and I think unwise moment in the history of the world and in the history of the Middle East for this request to be made and for that request to be acceded to by this Congress. It seems to me that at this moment we ought not to be sending weapons of death and destruction, but we ought to be sending weapons, if you will, to correct the social ills, to correct the environmental problems left in the wake of the war, to educate the people, to give them health care, but not deliver weapons of destruction.

After all, the region is only still settling down. It is still in a state of flux. The post-war regional peace talks that were convened under the joint aegis of the United States and of the Soviet Union, now Russia, are now being pursued to an end, not as quickly as I would like, but there are some certain portents that peace could ensue.

It would be I think a jarring inconsistency with these peace talks to send

destabilizing armaments into that very region.

Mr. Speaker, later this month there will be international arms control conferences, starting here in Washington, hoping to lead to a moment where the major nations of the world would not ship arms with abandon around the world.

And in June, 1 month hereafter, the Israeli Government will have its elections and, of course, those elections are looked at very carefully to be indications of the future from the standpoint of the peace talks and how they will be concluded.

Again, Mr. Speaker, these are not propitious times for the United States to consider selling arms in the region.

I would, therefore, Mr. Speaker, hope that the president will not send that request for 72 F-15's up to the Hill. But, if the President feels constrained to make that request, I hope that this Congress will, in the cause of peace, deny that request, reject it out of hand, and give peace a chance.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 5100, THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1992

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 5100, the Trade Expansion Act of 1992, a bill to strengthen the international trade position of the United States. This bill reflects a sincere effort to bring all of us together, Democrats and Republicans, the Congress and the Administration, to tackle our Nation's trade problems in a bipartisan manner. I recognize that the administration and some of my colleagues may prefer not to consider a trade bill at all this year. They would prefer to have us wait until the Uruguay round of the GATT and a North American Free-Trade Agreement can be successfully negotiated. As a Member who supported the extension of fast-track authority to pursue such negotiations and who worked diligently for its passage, I say that is not good enough.

First of all, we all recognize that neither agreement, even if successfully negotiated, will fundamentally address our major trade problem. That is, our country's persistent trade deficit with Japan. As the round continues to bog down over an impasse with the European Community over agriculture, our economic situation continues to deteriorate. Increasing numbers of United States jobs are being lost due to layoffs and plant closings as the United States market continues to absorb more and more Japanese imports, while the Japanese market continues to be restricted to United States exports, particularly in the automotive sector.

While the United States trade deficit with the world has been cut in half in recent years, our deficit with Japan remains stubbornly high. The United States trade deficit with Japan was \$57 billion in 1987, but it was still \$43 billion last year. And most of that deficit was in autos and auto parts. Our trade deficit with Japan is

expected to worsen again next year. Meanwhile, Japan's trade surplus with the rest of the world was \$78 billion last year, up from \$64 billion in 1990.

While I disagree with those who argue that a trade bill is unnecessary, I am also aware that some of my congressional colleagues would like to ignore our international obligations and pass a trade bill which restricts access to our market. Although such an approach might be politically popular particularly in this, an election year, we all know it would not be in the best long-term interests of our country. Exports are an essential component of economic growth in the United States. In fact, increased exports have been the one bright spot in the recession. Closing our market would inevitably lead to the closing of foreign markets to U.S. exports and the loss of U.S. jobs. On the other hand, the United States cannot continue to be a chump for the rest of the world. We must aggressively pursue the elimination of trade barriers around the world which restrict access to U.S. exports, and pursue the golden rule of trade: "Do unto others, as they do unto us."

Mr. Speaker, my bill is both responsive to the trade problems this country is facing and is responsible. Every provision in the bill is consistent with our international trade obligations.

The bill would extend the Super 301 authority which was enacted in the 1988 omnibus trade bill and proved effective in opening markets during its 2-year existence. Its extension will give the administration an important tool to pry open foreign markets which are now closed to U.S. exports. The bill also incorporates the provisions of Mr. Matsui's Trade Agreements Compliance Act, which provides an effective mechanism for private parties to work with the Government to insure that commitments made by our trading partners to open markets are fully carried out.

The bill provides a comprehensive scheme to address the trade problems we are experiencing with Japan in the automotive sector. It sets forth a two-pronged approach, aimed primarily at opening the Japanese market to United States exports of automobiles and automobile parts through the mandatory initiation of a section 301 investigation and negotiation of an access agreement. It also would allow some breathing space for United States manufacturers in the domestic market by mandating the negotiation of a voluntary restraint agreement between the United States and Japan to freeze the total number of Japanese vehicles which can be sold in the United States market to 1992 levels. Such an agreement, if successfully negotiated, would be in effect through 1999, and would allow for growth in the United States market to the same extent as United States exports of automobiles to Japan are allowed to grow. I want to emphasize that this provision asks nothing more of the administration than the European Community was able to deliver for its automobile manufacturers and workers in its voluntary restraint agreement with Japan concluded last year. Such an agreement would be consistent with our international obligations in light of the draft Dunkel text which would permit each GATT signatory to maintain a single voluntary restraint agreement, notwithstanding other GATT rules.

The bill also creates a more effective mechanism for preventing circumvention of outstanding antidumping and countervailing duty orders while further strengthening such laws in a GATT consistent manner. It also expresses the congressional position that the administration remain strong in resisting efforts to fundamentally weaken such laws in the Uruguay round.

Among the other important provisions in the bill is the Customs Modernization Act, which streamlines customs procedures for processing merchandise to the benefit of both the Government and the private sector; a mandate to negotiate international agreements to address the trade problems resulting from private anticompetitive behavior; and a provision to limit imports of machine tools from Taiwan to previously established levels pending an agreement to extend the expired voluntary restraint agreement with Taiwan. A detailed summary of the bill's provisions is appended to my statement.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that this bill represents an important step forward in resolving our Nation's trade problems. I look forward to working with the administration and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to improve this legislation as it moves through the legislative process. We must work together to put our economic house in order and this legislation can contribute significantly to that end.

SUMMARY OF H.R. 5100, THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1992

TITLE I. MARKET ACCESS PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Enforcement of United States rights under trade agreements and response to certain foreign trade practices

Section 101. Extension of "Super 301" Authority for 5 Years.

Extends "Super 301" authority under section 310, Trade Act of 1974 for 5 years, 1993-1997. "Super 301" requires the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) to identify annually, based on specific criteria, priority foreign countries and priority practices, including major barriers and trade-distorting practices, for trade liberalization negotiations and initiation of "section 301" investigations.

Section 102. Sense of Congress Regarding the Implementation of "Super 301".

Expresses the sense of the Congress that foreign countries that have substantial and persistent trade surpluses with the United States and maintain acts, policies, or practices that are major barriers to, or distortions of, potential U.S. export trade should be identified as priority countries and the acts, policies, or practices as priority practices under "Super 301".

Section 103. Review of the Compliance by Foreign Countries with Bilateral Trade Agreements.

Incorporates the "Trade Agreements Compliance Act", H.R. 1115, as amended and reported by the Subcommittee on Trade, to provide procedures (as a new section 306A of the Trade Act of 1974) for annual USTR reviews upon private sector request of foreign compliance with bilateral trade agreements, except the U.S.-Israel and U.S.-Canada free trade agreements; affirmative findings within 90 days of noncompliance mandate "section 301" action.

Section 104. Increased Access of United States Rice and Rice Products to the Japanese, Korean, and Taiwanese Markets.

Requires the USTR, within 45 days after enactment, to self-initiate a "section 301"

investigation of all acts, policies, and practices of Japan, Korea, and Taiwan that affect the access of U.S. rice and rice products to each of these markets. During the investigation, the USTR shall seek the elimination of these acts, policies, and practices either during the Uruguay Round of GATT Multilateral Trade Negotiations or on a bilateral basis. The USTR must report to the Congress by March 1, 1993, whether and to what extent the negotiations have been successful, or the reasons and proposed actions if they are not successful.

Subtitle B—International trade in motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts

Section 111. Increased Access of United States Motor Vehicles and Motor Vehicle Parts to the Japanese Market.

Requires the USTR, within 45 days after enactment, to self-initiate a "section 301" investigation of all acts, policies, and practices of Japan (including those used in the distribution system, the toleration of systematic anticompetitive activities by or among private firms, including Keiretsu relationships, exclusionary business practices, and government regulation and testing requirements) that affect access to the Japanese market for exports of motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts produced by U.S. manufacturers.

Requires the USTR, during the investigation, to seek a trade agreement with the Government of Japan that

Eliminates or modifies those aspects of the acts, policies, and practices that act as barriers to the Japanese market for U.S. exports of motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts;

Provides for prompt implementation and enforcement of prior commitments made by the Japanese Government with respect to trade in, and purchase of, U.S. motor vehicle and motor vehicle parts by Japanese vehicle manufacturers;

Establishes longer-term goals for the purchase by Japanese vehicle manufacturers of high value-added motor vehicle parts and accessories from U.S. manufacturers through immediate parts sourcing arrangements and "design-in" projects aimed at new model development; and

Establishes procedures for exchange of information between appropriate U.S. and Japanese Government agencies that will permit accurate assessment of bilateral trade in motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts, particularly the extent of Japanese purchase of parts produced by U.S. manufacturers.

The USTR should seek the support of other interested foreign governments in obtaining such an agreement.

If the negotiations are not successful, the USTR must submit to the Congress a report detailing the reasons why and setting forth the actions that will be taken or proposed.

Section 112. Voluntary Restraint Agreement Regarding the Exportation to the United States of Motor Vehicles From Japan.

Requires the President to negotiate a voluntary restraint arrangement (VRA) with Japan providing for the limitation by Japan of exports of automobiles and light trucks to the United States during each of the years 1993 through 1999:

In any restraint year, the number of vehicles exported from Japan to the United States plus the number of vehicles produced by U.S. subsidiaries of Japanese manufacturers cannot exceed that aggregate number in 1992;

Exports of vehicles from Japan to the United States in any restraint year cannot exceed the number exported to the United States in 1992, reduced by total production of

vehicles by U.S. subsidiaries of Japanese manufacturers in the preceding year;

The export level and aggregate ceiling shall increase in 1994 by any increase in the number of vehicles imported by Japan from the United States in 1993, but in any year after 1994 only by the amount that were produced and exported by the Big Three manufacturers if not at least a majority of exported vehicles were produced by the Big Three manufacturers in the preceding year.

Authorizes the President to carry out such actions as may be necessary or appropriate to enforce any restriction, condition, or term of the VRA, including requirements that valid export licenses or other documentation issued by the Government of Japan be presented as a condition for entry of vehicles into the U.S. customs territory.

Conditions the implementation and continuation of the VRA on an annual determination by the President that each of the Big Three have made and are fulfilling satisfactory commitments to implement further specific measures (1) to be internationally competitive in the automotive sector (e.g., investment of earnings in production-process and management efficiencies); (2) production of cost-competitive and quality-competitive products; (3) exercise of price restraint; (4) payment of executive compensation commensurate with corporate performance; and (5) operation of programs for worker retraining and other adjustment assistance.

Determinations will take into account an annual report from the International Trade Commission (ITC) to the President and to the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance committees on industry fulfillment of the commitments; the ITC will also report on the economic effects of the VRA and the international trade performance of each motor vehicle manufacturer.

The President must submit a report to the Congress within 6 months after enactment on the status of the negotiations, and within 30 days if he determines negotiations are not successful.

Section 113. Consequential Action Regarding Other Japanese Anticompetitive Behavior Affecting the Domestic Motor Vehicle Parts Industry.

Expresses the sense of the Congress that the USTR should, during the course of its "section 301" investigation required under section 201, refer to appropriate U.S. Government agencies all applicable information obtained about the acts, policies, and practices of Japan that adversely affect access to the purchasing by Japanese motor vehicle manufacturers in the United States of motor vehicle parts produced by U.S.-owned or controlled parts manufacturers.

Section 114. Foreign-Trade Zone Operations of Producers in the Motor Vehicle and Motor Vehicle Parts Industry.

Requires the Board established under the Foreign Trade Zones Act to review the operations of U.S. and foreign producers in the motor vehicle and motor vehicle parts industry to determine whether their foreign-trade zones have a net positive economic effect on the United States, according to the standards set forth in the Act and regulations. On the basis of the review, the Board shall take appropriate action authorized by existing law and regulations, including possible revocation or modification of any grant, with respect to any producer whose operations in a zone are not having a net positive effect on the U.S. economy.

TITLE II. CUSTOMS MODERNIZATION

Incorporates H.R. 3935, the "Customs Modernization and Informed Compliance Act", as

amended and ordered reported by the Subcommittee on Trade. This Act

Removes archaic statutory provisions requiring "paper" documentation and provides authority for full electronic processing of all customs related transactions; authorizes procedures for the establishment of a National Computer Automation Program for automated and electronic processing of commercial shipments.

Improves and clarifies Customs enforcement authority with respect to submission of documentation, recordkeeping and examination procedures, and penalty and seizure provisions.

Amends miscellaneous provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 related to duty collection, vessel entry and clearance procedures, disposition of seized or other merchandise which remains in Customs custody and recourse to and by Customs for settlement of liabilities.

TITLE III. CUSTOMS AND TRADE AGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1993 AND 1994

Incorporates a draft bill ordered reported by the Subcommittee on Trade that authorizes appropriations for the ITC, U.S. Customs Service, and the USTR for fiscal years 1993 and 1994 and repeals the East-West trade statistics monitoring system under section 410, Trade Act of 1974.

TITLE IV. MISCELLANEOUS TRADE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Nontariff Provisions

Section 401. Negotiations on Anticompetitive Practices.

Authorizes and urges the President to negotiate, as soon as practicable, trade agreements that (1) eliminate the adverse effects of private anticompetitive practices on international trade; (2) harmonize national laws on competition policy, and the implementation of those laws, as they relate to international trade; (3) establish mechanisms for the effective enforcement across national boundaries of national laws on competition policy as they relate to international trade; and (4) make the GATT compatible with these new agreements and U.S. law on competition policy. The President shall report to the Congress by March 1, 1993 on the status of such negotiations.

Section 402. Trade with Cuba.

Expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should take all feasible steps to ensure the effectiveness of the U.S. embargo of Cuba and should promptly seek negotiations with foreign countries that conduct trade with Cuba to obtain their agreement to restrict their trade relations with Cuba consistent with U.S. trade restrictions.

Section 403. Machine Tool Import Arrangements.

Requires enforcement of the quantitative limitations on machine tool imports under the previous bilateral arrangement with Taiwan, until extension of the bilateral arrangement is negotiated with Taiwan (H.R. 4756, introduced by Mrs. Johnson).

Section 404. Simplification of Certain United States International Trade Laws.

Requires the ITC to prepare and submit to the Congress by January 1, 1994, a report containing suggested legislative proposals for consolidating and simplifying U.S. international trade laws under which tariffs or quantitative or other restrictions may be imposed on imports (other than the Harmonized Tariff Schedule). The ITC should seek to achieve (1) the logical arrangement of these laws; (2) the elimination of anomalous, duplicative, and illogical provisions; (3) simplification of language; and (4) no substantive or procedural change from the existing provisions.

Section 405. Congressional Research Service Special Trade Unit.

Requires the Director of the Congressional Research Service (CRS) to make recommendations to the Congress concerning the establishment of a special unit that would (1) integrate the capabilities and resources of the CRS, the ITC, and other appropriate agencies; and (2) serve as a central and objective source of information and analysis for the Congress on data and trends in trade between the United States and foreign countries.

Subtitle B—Foreign Subsidies and Countervailing Duties and Antidumping Duties

Section 411. Administrative Review of Determinations.

Requires the Department of Commerce to complete administrative reviews with 270 days after receiving a request for a review.

Section 412. Material Injury.

Requires the ITC to take into account contracts with a long lead time in determining where there is material injury due to subsidized or dumped imports. It also specifies that the presence or absence of any factor which the Commission is required to evaluate shall not necessarily give decisive guidance with respect to the determination by the Commission of the threat of material injury.

Section 413. Dual Pricing of Inputs.

Precludes any adjustments in determination of foreign market value under the antidumping law for differences in input costs that are based on whether the end product made from the input is sold in the home market or exported.

Section 414. Report, and Access to Data, Regarding Countervailing and Antidumping Duty Collections.

Requires the U.S. Customs Service to prepare and transmit to the Department of Commerce an annual report setting forth the amount of duties collected during the preceding year under each countervailing and antidumping duty order. Commerce must then make that information available upon request to an interested party that initiated the petition.

(Sections 411–414 above are based on provisions contained in H.R. 3272)

Section 415. Prevention of Circumvention or Diversion of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders.

Incorporates provisions of H.R. 5045, which is designed to strengthen current law with respect to circumvention of antidumping and countervailing duty orders. Among other things, these provisions would expand existing law to include within the scope of an original antidumping order parts and components supplied by a third country supplier who had historically supplied such parts and components to the original producer if such parts and components are included in products assembled in the United States or a third country, and have significant value. It would also expand existing law with respect to when imported merchandise from third countries may be included within the scope of an original antidumping duty order.

Section 416. Study by the Administering Authorities on Ways to Simplify Initiation of Countervailing and Antidumping Duty Actions.

Directs the Secretary of Commerce and the ITC to present to Congress no later than 180 days after enactment a study, including recommendations, on how the standards for initiating countervailing and antidumping duty cases could be modified so as to make initiation of such cases less costly and more accessible for domestic petitioners. Due consid-

eration in this study should be given to U.S. obligations under international trade agreements.

Section 417. Reports by United States Trade Representative on Operation of Commercial Aircraft Agreement.

Incorporates Title II of H.R. 5021, which requires the USTR to submit a report to the Congress within 60 days and annually thereafter on the operation of the Agreement Concerning the Application of the GATT Agreement on Trade in Civil Aircraft between the United States and the European Community.

Section 418. International Trade Agreements on Antidumping.

Expresses the sense of Congress that the President should not enter into any international trade agreement on antidumping requiring changes in U.S. antidumping laws which would reduce their effectiveness as a remedy against injurious dumped imports. Urges the President to review carefully draft Uruguay Round provisions on antidumping and to seek changes necessary to maintain and to strengthen the effectiveness of U.S. antidumping laws, including cumulation of injury and dispute settlement provisions.

Section 419. Trade Distorting Subsidies by Foreign Governments.

Incorporates H. Res. 417, which expresses the sense of the House that the U.S. Government should not, as a matter of official policy, condone or legitimize the use of trade-distorting practices by foreign governments that cause material injury to U.S. industries.

Subtitle C—Other Tariff Provisions

Section 421. Treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences of the Republics Formerly within the Soviet Union.

Amends section 502(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 to remove the prohibition on eligibility of the former USSR for beneficiary status under the Generalized System of Preferences program.

Section 422. Miscellaneous Tariff Provisions.

Incorporates 12 sections of H.R. 4318, the "Miscellaneous Tariff Act of 1992", as reported by the Subcommittee on Trade, that raise revenue or are revenue-neutral:

Classification

Sec. 2002—Reclassifies certain motor fuel and motor fuel blending stock.

Classification and Duty Increase

Sec. 2003—Reclassifies and restores the duty on linear alkylbenzenesulfonates and linear alkylbenzenesulfonic acids.

Sec. 2004—Reclassifies and increases the duty on certain iron and steel pipes and tubes.

Customs and Other Non-tariff Matters

Sec. 2103—Alters the rebate procedures for wage certificates issued to certain producers of watches and watch movements.

Sec. 2104—Alters the personal exemption allowance relating to Bermuda.

Sec. 2105—Alters provisions relating to duty-free import of sweaters assembled in Guam.

Sec. 2110—Allows Customs to process certain refunds owed.

Sec. 2111—Reissues a Production Incentive Certificate.

Sec. 2113—Exempts semiconductors from the country of origin marking requirement.

Sec. 2114—Renews the exclusion provision in the Free Trade Zones Act.

Sec. 2117—Allows certain yards of fabric to be donated to charitable (nonprofit) organizations with specific restrictions stated.

Sec. 2119—Extends the time allowed for certain reexportations.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING CURRENT LEVEL OF SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEARS 1992-96

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Budget and as chairman of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on the Budget and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the official letter to the Speaker advising him of the current level of revenues for fiscal years 1992 through 1996 and spending for fiscal year 1992. Spending levels for fiscal years 1993 through 1996 are not included because annual appropriations acts for those years have not been enacted.

This is the sixth report of the 102d Congress for fiscal year 1992. This report is based on the aggregate levels and committee allocations for fiscal years 1992 through 1996 as contained in House Report No. 102-69, the conference report to accompany House Concurrent Resolution 121.

The term "current level" refers to the estimated amount of budget authority, outlays, entitlement authority, and revenues that are available—or will be used—for the full fiscal year in question based only on enacted law.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I intend to keep the House informed regularly on the status of the current level.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,

Washington, DC, May 6, 1992.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: To facilitate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, I am herewith transmitting the status report on the current level of revenues for fiscal years 1992 through 1996 and spending estimates for fiscal year 1992, under H. Con. Res. 121, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1992. Spending levels for fiscal years 1993 through 1996 are not included be-

cause annual appropriations acts for those years have not been enacted.

The enclosed tables also compare enacted legislation to each committee's 602(a) allocation of discretionary new budget authority and new entitlement authority. The 602(a) allocations to House Committees made pursuant to H. Con. Res. 121 were printed in the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on the resolution (H. Report 102-69).

Sincerely,

LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1992 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 121—REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF MAY 5, 1992

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal years—1992	1992-96
Appropriate level:		
Budget authority	1,269,300	6,591,900
Outlays	1,201,600	6,134,100
Revenues	850,400	4,832,000
Current level:		
Budget authority	1,277,082	NA
Outlays	1,207,718	NA
Revenues	853,364	4,829,000
Current level over(+)/under(-) appropriate level:		
Budget authority	+7,782	NA
Outlays	+6,119	NA
Revenues	+2,964	-3,000

Note.—NA=Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for those years have not been enacted.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Any measure that provides new budget or entitlement authority for fiscal year 1992 that is not included in the current level estimate for that year, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of budget authority for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 121, to be exceeded.

OUTLAYS

Any measure that 1) provides new budget or entitlement authority that is not included in the current level estimate for fiscal year 1992, and 2) increases outlays in fiscal year 1992, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of outlays for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 121, to be exceeded.

REVENUES

Any measure that would result in a revenue loss, that is not included in the current level revenue estimate and exceeds \$2,964 million for fiscal year 1992, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 121. Any measure that would result in a revenue loss that is not included in the current level revenue estimate for fiscal years 1992 through 1996, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for those years as set forth in H. Con. Res. 121.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION

(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1992		New entitlement authority	1992-96		New entitlement authority
	Budget authority	Outlays		Budget authority	Outlays	
House committee:						
Agriculture:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	3,720	3,540	4,716
Current level	-2	-2	-1	-1	-1	(1)

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—Continued

(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1992		New entitlement author- ity	1992-96		New entitlement author- ity
	Budget authority	Outlays		Budget authority	Outlays	
Difference	-2	-2	-1	-3,719	-3,539	-4,716
Armed Services:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	-7	-7	0	-83	-83
Difference		-7	-7		-83	-83
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	28	28	0	177	177	0
Difference	+28	+28		+177	+177	
District of Columbia:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Education and Labor:						
Appropriate level	0	0	56	0	0	20,153
Current level	0	0	0	0	4	0
Difference	0	0	-56	0	+4	-20,153
Energy and Commerce:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Foreign Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Government Operations:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
House Administration:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Interior and Insular Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	-2	-2	0	5	5	0
Difference	-2	-2		+5	+5	
Judiciary:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	16	16	16
Difference				+16	+16	+16
Merchant Marine and Fisheries:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	(1)	0	0	(1)
Difference			(1)			(1)
Post Office and Civil Service:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Public Works and Transportation:						
Appropriate level	16,358	0	0	117,799	0	0
Current level	18,514	0	0	113,048	0	0
Difference	+2,156	0	0	-4,751	0	0
Science, Space, and Technology:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Small Business:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Veterans' Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	484	0	0	6,811
Current level	0	5	378	0	19	2,182
Difference	0	+5	-106	0	+19	-4,629
Ways and Means:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	620
Current level	7,036	7,036	8,036	7,458	7,458	9,098

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—Continued

(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1992		New entitlement author- ity	1992-96		New entitlement author- ity
	Budget authority	Outlays		Budget authority	Outlays	
Difference	+7,036	+7,036	+8,036	+7,458	+7,458	+8,478
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Difference	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	+1

¹ Less than \$500,000.

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1992

(In millions of dollars)

	Revised 602(b) subdivisions		Latest current level		Difference	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Commerce-Justice-State-judiciary	21,070	20,714	21,029	20,708	-41	-6
Defense	270,244	275,222	269,860	275,038	-384	-184
District of Columbia	700	690	700	690	0	0
Energy and water development	21,875	20,770	21,875	20,720	0	-50
Foreign operations	15,285	13,556	14,448	13,470	-837	-86
Interior	13,102	12,050	13,105	12,198	3	148
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education	59,087	57,797	59,096	57,843	9	46
Legislative	2,344	2,317	2,343	2,310	-1	-7
Military construction	8,564	8,482	8,563	8,433	-1	-49
Rural development, Agriculture, and related agencies	12,299	11,226	12,299	11,223	0	-3
Transportation	13,765	31,800	13,762	31,799	-3	-1
Treasury-Postal service	10,825	11,120	10,824	11,119	-1	-1
VA-HUD-independent agencies	63,953	61,714	63,942	61,711	-11	-3
Grand total	513,113	527,458	511,846	527,262	-1267	-196

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 6, 1992.

Hon. LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the on-budget current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, and estimated revenues for fiscal year 1992 in comparison with the appropriate levels for those items contained in the 1992 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 121). This report is tabulated as of close of business May 5, 1992 and is summarized as follows:

(In millions of dollars)

	House current level	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 121)	Current level +/- resolution
Budget authority	1,277,082	1,269,300	+7,782
Outlays	1,207,718	1,201,600	+6,119
Revenues:			
1992	853,364	850,400	+2,964
1992-96	4,829,000	4,832,000	-3,000

Since my last report, dated April 8, 1992, there has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays or revenues.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,
Director.

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT, 102D CONG., 2D SESS., HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAY 5, 1992

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			853,364
Revenues			
Permanents and other spending			
legislation	807,617	727,237	
Appropriation legislation	686,331	703,643	
Mandatory adjustments ¹	(1,208)	950	
Offsetting receipts	(232,542)	(232,542)	

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT, 102D CONG., 2D SESS., HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAY 5, 1992—Continued

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Total previously enacted ²	1,260,198	1,199,288	853,364
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
Emergency unemployment compensation extension (Public Law 102-244)	2,706	2,706	
American technology preeminence (Public Law 102-245)			(³)
Further continuing appropriations, 1992 (Public Law 102-266) ⁴	14,178	5,724	
Total enacted this session	16,884	8,430	
MANDATORY ADJUSTMENTS ¹			
Technical Correction to the Food Stamp Act (Public Law 102-265)	(²)	(²)	
Total current level	1,277,082	1,207,719	853,364
Total budget resolution	1,269,300	1,201,600	850,400
Amount remaining:			
Over budget resolution	7,782	6,119	2,964
Under budget resolution			

¹ Adjustments required to conform with current law estimates for entitlements and other mandatory programs in the concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 121).

² Excludes the continuing resolution enacted last session (Public Law 102-145) that expired Mar. 31, 1992.

³ Less than \$500,000.

⁴ In accordance with section 251(a)(2)(D)(i) of the Budget Enforcement Act the amount shown for Public Law 102-266 does not include \$107 million in budget authority and \$28 million in outlays in emergency funding for SBA disaster loans.

RATIFICATION OF THE MADISON AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, today is a very historic day in the United States. Today the State of Michigan became the 38th State to ratify the original Madison amendment. Therefore, today we have the 27th amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The Madison amendment says simply that no law that varies the compensation for the services of Senators and Representatives can become effective until an election of Representatives has intervened.

The House in the 1989 Ethics in Government Act inserted that same language. The House followed the words of Madison when it gave itself its last pay raise. Madison proposed these words in September in 1789.

The necessary States to ratify this amendment did not occur in 1791. For all these years this amendment was laying there, proposed without a deadline.

Since 1978, 31 States have ratified this amendment, three this week.

The reason I am here today is to thank my colleagues in the freshman class on both sides of the aisle who participated in this project. This class has been heavily involved in the reform movement. We agreed early on that we needed a project to help bond our class around reform. This was our project and we have worked with those 15 remaining States that have not ratified this amendment. Earlier this week on Tuesday, the States of Alabama and Missouri ratified the amendment, setting up the historic day today when Michigan at 11:13 this morning was the 38th State to ratify the Madison amendment.

This is a long process that has endured, and the long process of reform is underway in America.

□ 1550

This is one small step that Congress and the American people have taken so that Congress will again become more accountable to the people in America. Nobody in America can give themselves a pay raise without getting the

boss' vote. And what this amendment does is it give the bosses, our bosses, the American voters, the right to judge whether we should have a pay increase or not.

Mr. Speaker, it is a responsible measure, and I hope and pray that it is certified by the Secretary of State and does in fact stay in effect.

UPDATE ON THE AIDS EPIDEMIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOSTMAYER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I will not use the whole 60 minutes. What I wanted to do today is to give my colleagues and anybody else who may be listening a little update on the AIDS crisis facing America.

Mr. Speaker, you know, AIDS has become, like a lot of things because we hear about them day in and day out, it has become something that we are sensitized to. We hear about somebody down the block or across town, they get AIDS, and we do not think it is ever going to happen to us.

So today I would like to give my colleagues and anyone in America who is paying attention the latest statistics on AIDS.

Mr. Speaker, the Centers for Disease Control say that we currently have 218,301 people in this country who are dead or dying of the AIDS virus. They have also said that they may have to upgrade their figures by about 50 percent because of the way they have been counting people who have active AIDS. That means that we probably have somewhere around 350,000 people dead or dying of this dread disease.

Now, about 5 years ago I became very interested in the AIDS pandemic, and I started working with leading scientists, doctors, statisticians, to try to keep track of the disease and try to come up with some answers.

We projected that by 1991, if we had the current rate of growth in the AIDS virus back 5 years ago, that we would have between 250,000 and 280,000 people dead or dying of the disease.

Based upon the projections we see right now, we are ahead of schedule. We are ahead of schedule. That means that if our projections are accurate, by the mid-1990's we are going to have between 1 million and 2 million Americans dead or dying of this disease.

Now, it costs \$100,000 to \$150,000 for each person who gets the disease, to take care of their medical costs between the time they get the disease and the time they die. Put a pencil to that and you can see this is going to be terribly draining on the American economy and the American health care system. And we are not really doing much about it.

The Centers for Disease Control tell us that 1 out of every 250 people in this

country has the AIDS virus. How many people do you pass in a day? How many people do you see on the streets in a day?

One out of every 250 people, they say, has the AIDS virus. They say we have about 1.5 million people infected. That is what they told us 5 years ago, and they said it was doubling every year to 18 months.

The terrible thing about AIDS is that it is insidious. You do not know anybody has it, because they can carry it for up to 10 years without any manifestation of the disease being noticeable.

So what I think is that we probably have more like 4 to 6 million people infected, not 1.5 million, but 4 to 6 million.

What does that mean? If we have 4 million infected, that means 1 out of every 60 Americans is carrying the AIDS virus, 1 out of every 60.

Now, I see here in the Chamber today a lot of teenagers. The teenagers and college students of today are the ones most at risk, most at risk of the AIDS virus.

A few years ago, everybody said, well, it was the homosexual community that was causing the problem and they were the most at risk. But the fact of the matter is statistics now show us that it is at least into the heterosexual community and the most active people in our society are teenagers and our college-age students, and they are the ones who are most at risk.

I would like to give you some figures. AIDS is now the third leading cause of death among people between the ages of 25 and 44, and it is growing at an alarming rate.

Mr. Speaker, the World Health Organization predicts there is going to be a 10-fold increase in the number of AIDS cases in this country and in this world by the year 2000. They think there is going to be 30 to 40 million people around the world with the AIDS virus within the next 8 years, and I think that is a conservative figure.

Approximately 100,000 teenagers and adolescents now have the AIDS virus. About 2,000 have already contracted the disease, and I think that figure is low.

Now let us talk about the teenagers in this country. There have been some recent surveys that show that approximately 54 percent of the teenagers in this country are sexually active. And the vast majority of those are not using the safe-sex method that you see talked about on TV; the condoms, even if they do use them, there is still a 16- to 20-percent risk that they are going to get the infection anyhow if they are messing with somebody that has the AIDS virus.

But those who are not run an even greater risk.

We need to do more than just educate young people about the AIDS virus. We

need to have a comprehensive program to deal with it. The future of the United States of America rests not with people of my generation but with the people of the teenage and college years of today. They are the ones who are going to produce the products that keep us competitive in the world tomorrow. Those are going to be the ones who will be the engine driving the economy of the United States in the year 2000 and beyond. And if we lose a large segment of the young people of this country to a terrible, dread disease like AIDS, it not only will cut short their lives but it will hurt dramatically the United States of America in many, many different ways.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, I had a committee hearing not long ago on the AIDS virus. I am the senior Republican on the Africa Subcommittee, and we had the President of Uganda's wife testify before our committee. Uganda has a terrible, terrible problem, and I would like to tell my colleagues about it because Uganda is about 5 years or 6 years ahead of us on the AIDS scale.

They find there that 7 percent of all the children in Uganda are orphaned because of the AIDS virus. Sixteen percent of the kids over there have at least one parent that has died of AIDS. There has been a terrible decline in the population, in the production, over there because of the AIDS virus, and the young are extremely hard hit.

They have been trying to deal with the problems of AIDS in Uganda from an education standpoint, like we have here in the United States, and it has not worked. She told us that they need a comprehensive program to deal with it, which they cannot really afford because it involves a lot of things that they do not have the money to deal with, like testing, contact tracing, and education, and scientific research. There are a lot of things that need to be done that they cannot do.

And they estimate that half of their population in Uganda, half, has the AIDS virus, and it is growing at a rapid rate. Go into the villages in Uganda, and Kenya, and Zaire, and Zimbabwe and elsewhere, and one will find villages where half of the population between the ages of, say, 15 and 40, are dead. The only people left are the very, very young and the very, very old.

And how are they dealing with it over there? They are trying to deal with it through the education process.

I have talked to my colleagues in this Chamber year in and year out for the last 5 years. We have our head in the sack. We are not dealing with this pandemic, and it is growing at a rapid rate, and now it is no longer considered to be just a homosexual disease. It is a heterosexual disease, and the hardest-hit segment of our population in the next 10 to 20 years are going to be the

teenagers, the college-age students and the young adults that are the future of this Nation.

So, what is the answer? Well, first of all we should study what is going on in other countries that are ahead of us on the progression table as far as AIDS is concerned, like Uganda, and we ought to profit from the problems that they are having. We, in this country, are the wealthiest country in the world, and we have the wherewithal to come up with a comprehensive program to deal with AIDS, and we must do it because, if we do not, every one of us is going to be hurt, if not by losing a loved one, then because of the economic and health care problems that are going to ensue from the expansion of this disease.

We have 1.3 million hospital beds in America, and we are going to have another million people dead or dying of AIDS by the middle of this decade. Where are we going to put these people? How are we going to provide adequate health care? How are we going to do all the things that are necessary to make sure that everybody's health care is protected, not just those who have the AIDS virus?

We are going to have to come to grips with this, and we are going to have to come to grips with it quickly. You see, if we have 4 to 6 million people infected, as I believe we do right now, those people in the next decade will become active AIDS patients, and they will be dying from this disease, and each one of them is going to cost the taxpayers of this country and the health care system of this country about 100 to \$150,000, and it is going to be a very, very difficult thing for us to deal with.

So, what is the answer? Well, I say to my colleagues again tonight, we need a comprehensive program to deal with it. The Centers for Disease Control, the Health and Human Services agency in this Government have said, "We need to attack this from the standpoint of educating the young people about safe sex." The fact is there is no such thing as safe sex outside of a monogamous, one-man one-woman relationship or abstinence. If someone has sex using a condom, the chances of someone getting AIDS, if that person is with someone that has the virus, is 15 to 20 percent because that is the failure rate of those devices, and of course it goes up much more rapidly by not using them, so the only safe sex is a monogamous relationship or abstinence.

But we are not dealing with the problem in a rational manner. We are just trying to educate people about this, so I would like to tell my colleagues tonight what I suggest we do, and I am going to read from this bill briefly so that the people know what we are trying to accomplish here. I have a House concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Federal

Government should develop and implement a comprehensive program to deal with the AIDS virus and the transmission of it, and I would like to read it to my colleagues.

"Whereas the acquired immune deficiency syndrome is a fatal disease for which there currently is no known cure"; if someone gets it, they are going to die, and "Whereas, as of February 1992, the Centers for Disease Control had identified at least 213,641 individuals in the United States who had died or" are dying of the disease, and we believe it is about 150,000 more than that; "Whereas the Centers for Disease Control have proposed to revise their definition of the disease in a manner that would increase the number of individuals in the United States who are identified as having died or suffering from the disease to more than 370,000 by the end of" this year; "Whereas the number of individuals in the United States who are identified by the Centers for Disease Control as having died or suffering from the disease has more than doubled," doubled, "every two years since the Centers began identifying such individuals; Whereas certain projections from statistics of the Centers for Disease Control indicate that there will be," at least a million people dead or dying of the disease "by the mid-1990s; Whereas an individual who is infected with the human immunodeficiency virus may not demonstrate any symptoms of acquired immune deficiency syndrome for 10 years or more after the date the individual becomes infected; Whereas the Centers for Disease Control have for 5 years estimated that as many as 1.5 million people in the United States are infected," and I think that is way, way low, and "Whereas the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, Antonia C. Novello, has stated that transmission of the virus through heterosexual contact is the mode of transmission that recently has shown the greatest percentage increase in certain parts of the United States; Whereas more than 75 percent of the individuals outside of the United States," with the AIDS virus, "contracted the disease through heterosexual contact; Whereas medical experts are still unsure about whether they have identified all of the" ways you can get the AIDS virus; "Whereas transmission of the virus between health care workers and patients during invasive procedures has been documented; Whereas at least a majority of teenagers and college age students in the United States are sexually active; Whereas, in 1988, the Centers for Disease Control made a conservative estimate that three out of every one thousand college students were infected with" HIV, and it is much higher than that now, "Whereas a study of teenagers in the District of Columbia between 1988 and 1990 documented a 300-percent increase in the number of teen-

agers infected with the virus; Whereas acquired immune deficiency syndrome is a preventable disease; Whereas the issues associated with the epidemic of human immunodeficiency virus infection have been treated like civil rights issues rather than public health issues," which it should not be. It should be treated as a public health issue first and foremost, and "Whereas the average cost of treating an individual who is infected with the human immunodeficiency virus is \$100,000 over the individual's lifetime; Whereas the United States has the medical and financial resources to resolve the problems associated with the pandemic of human immunodeficiency virus infection; and Whereas the Congress has failed to develop a comprehensive," program to deal with it, "Now, therefore, be it resolved," and here is my program:

"That it is the sense of the Congress that, No. 1, the Federal Government should develop and implement a comprehensive program to prevent further transmission of the human immunodeficiency virus and provide treatment for individuals who are infected with the virus; and, No. 2, the program should include mandatory routine testing for infection with the human," HIV, "virus of all individuals between 14 and 55," who live "in the United States; tracing of any individual who has been in contact in a manner that gives rise to a risk of transmission of the virus with an individual who is infected with the virus; medical and psychological treatment," in part, "funded by the Federal Government," where health insurance is not involved for individuals who are infected with the virus, and we are doing that anyhow. When somebody has AIDS, and they do not have health insurance, we are taking care of them. We cannot leave them on the streets. So, we are doing that already. "Additional medical research concerning the virus and acquired immune deficiency syndrome," should be conducted; "protection of the civil rights of individuals who are infected with the virus, and national public education campaign concerning the effects and modes of transmission of the virus, and Federal criminal penalties for individuals," who have the virus and "knowingly transmit it." We have individuals in this country who have the HIV virus, know they are dying of AIDS, and they go out and give it to other people for a number of reasons, some to get drug money, some because they want to take revenge on other people because of their problem, and we need to get those people off the streets and restrict them from contaminating other individuals. I mean if someone holds up a bank with a gun, they go to jail. If someone shoots somebody, they go to jail. But if they know they have the AIDS virus and they go and infect 10,

20, 30 people, there is no penalty for that, and there should be. I believe that every day that we wait, hundreds more individuals, maybe thousands more individuals, are being infected, and it is going to cost all of us dearly.

□ 1610

So I say to my colleagues tonight, if you are watching in your offices, or listening on the radio, or in the Chamber, please pay attention to this. This is not going to go away. If we put our heads in the sand like an ostrich and think that this problem is going to be resolved, we are dead wrong. Every day that we wait, more people are being condemned to die.

I have three children, one 28, one 17, and one 19, and I worry every single day about their possible exposure to the HIV virus.

I talk to them about it so much, that every time I bring up the subject they say "Oh, Dad, you are not going to talk to me about that again?"

But I tell you, teenagers and college-age students believe that they are invincible. They believe that they are going to live forever, that nothing can hurt them. They do not worry about things. And that is the terrible thing about this virus. It is insidious. They can be going with someone who has the virus. They do not know they have it. The person that is going with them does not know they have it, and they become involved, and another person becomes a casualty and is going to die a horrible, horrible death because of AIDS.

That is why I say to my colleagues time and again, I have come down here over the past 5 years, year-in, year-out, month-in, month-out, week-in, week-out, saying not just education, but a comprehensive program to deal with it. Protect people's civil rights. Do not single out any segment of our society for persecution because of this disease.

The homosexual community should not be singled out, the heterosexual community should not be singled out. We are all in this thing together, and we need a comprehensive program to save America and to help save the world.

There are going to be 50 million people dead or dying of this disease in the next 5 to 10 years, 50 million people around the world.

The United States, like I said, is about 5 or 6 years behind Uganda, and half of the population in that country is already infected. We cannot let that happen to America. We need a comprehensive program to deal with this.

CHINESE QUILTERS SEWING AMERICAN HERITAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am going to touch on two subjects. One concerns America's heritage, quilts from the Smithsonian that are now being produced in China, which we all object to.

In the other part of my presentation I am going to talk about the kidnapping of two American children in Yugoslavia by their father, and also a little bit about that unfortunate civil war fighting that is going on in that area.

Most of us have a quilt in our family that is a treasured possession because it was made with the loving hands of a family member or friend. For over 200 years, American women have invested time into creating quilts for their families and friends. So, I was dismayed to learn that the Smithsonian Institution is allowing our most heirloom quilts to be mass produced and sold like blankets.

It is outrageous that the Smithsonian Institution, which receives taxpayer's dollars, licensed American Pacific Co. to mass produce America's historical quilts, some of them one-of-a-kind. American Pacific has the material printed in the United States and then contracts with 20,000 Chinese workers to make the quilts.

One rare quilt, bearing the Great Seal of the United States, was made in 1830 by Susan Strong of Fredrick County, MD. Now it is being mass produced in China. According to some quilt experts, the very act of licensing these one-of-a-kind items has ruined the value of the original quilt.

Conversely, some of the fake quilts are being sold as antiques. One woman bought a fake quilt for the colors and later saw the identical quilt in an antique shop priced several hundred dollars higher and advertised as an American heirloom.

The licensing of these prized quilts for mass production as bedding will ultimately undermine the value of America's true antique quilts. Sotheby's recently auctioned an 1867 American pictorial Civil War quilt for \$264,000. What will these fakes do to the value of the Smithsonian collection?

Last year the Smithsonian made \$610,000 from royalties to 60 licensees for copying American artifacts. Counterfeit quilts are made in China, which has a wage rate as low as 25 cents an hour. Spiegel Catalogue is selling quilts made in China for \$200 to \$400. When asked about the copied quilts, Mr. Robert Longendyke, spokesperson for Spiegel, had the bad taste to say these Chinese quilts can be "the kind of item that will be passed along, that can become a family heirloom." That remark exhibits a total lack of knowledge of how women have poured their artistic efforts, heart and souls into designing and making quilts.

Quilters have reacted very strongly to the actions of the Smithsonian. The National Quilting Association of

Ellicott City, MD, noted that "quilters are distressed to see American quilts placed in the same category as plastic toys, shoes and novelty items."

American quilters object to the foreign quilts being advertised as a "traditional heirloom" or an "American heritage" when they are actually mass produced counterfeits from China.

I agree with them that it is disgraceful that a quilt such as the "Great Seal" which symbolizes American freedom and democracy is made in sweat shop conditions under a repressive Communist regime. This action is a mockery of the Smithsonian charter to preserve the American heritage and traditions.

Quilting has become an American artform in which women have traditionally expressed themselves. No two handcrafted quilts are the same. Now instead of a grandmother, an aunt or family member making these quilts for the newborns, a Chinese worker in a mass production factory will be making quilted American heirlooms.

There are approximately 2 million quilters in the United States. The National Quilting Association, which is headquartered in Maryland, has 236 chapters nationwide. The Quilting Newsletter of Wheat Ridge, CO, was established in 1969 and it has a readership of 250,000. There is a growing interest in quilting in America.

Groups are quilting, just as they have been since this country was settled. Churches hold quilting bees, friends quilt together and classes are held to teach new generations of quilters. Men also are joining quilting circles. Special shops are selling hand-made quilts.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to identify the true American quilt from the fake. Phony American quilts are coming in with flimsy labels identifying the country of origin but, the labels easily can be cut off. They should be stamped so the country of origin cannot be removed.

The Smithsonian should quit licensing those prized quilts which express the soul of America. Why should a museum using taxpayers dollars contribute to sending jobs off-shore when the country has over 9 million unemployed. The Smithsonian has abrogated its responsibility to the public by licensing companies to make fake quilts.

James Smithson, who left his fortune to the United States to create the Smithsonian would roll over in his grave if he knew what the museum is doing with these quilts.

□ 1620

A MOTHER'S NIGHTMARE (CONTINUED)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I said that I was going to talk also about some of the events in Yugoslavia. One of the saddest is concerning two American children, and we call it the Shayna Lazarevich child custody case.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again attack the inaction of the Serbian Government in resolving the Shayna Lazarevich child custody case.

Ms. Lazarevich, an American national, has not seen her two small children on any regular basis since October of 1989. It was at this time that her ex-husband, a Serbian national, in defiance of a State of California decree awarding Ms. Lazarevich custody of the children, fled with them to his native land.

Ms. Lazarevich initially contacted Representative ANTHONY BEILENSON, her local Congressman, for help in retrieving her children from Serbia. She then was referred to my office for help.

Upon initiating action in this case, I was informed that the matter of custody had been referred to the Serbian courts. The Supreme Court of Serbia eventually awarded Ms. Lazarevich custody.

Despite the decrees of both the Serbian and U.S. courts, Dragisa Lazarevich retained custody of the children, openly flouting the law. He apparently had contacts in the police department in Nis, the town to which he had fled, that allowed him to avoid surrendering the children.

In addition, using a legal loophole, he had the case heard in a lower court in Serbia, in order to keep the children.

Over the last 2 years, I have written countless letters to Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic, travelled to Belgrade to meet with him and other officials on this case, made countless telephone calls, and arranged appeals signed by more than 30 fellow Members, all on Ms. Lazarevich's behalf.

In addition, Ms. Lazarevich has been working closely at the same time with Warren Zimmerman, Ambassador to Yugoslavia, trying to apply diplomatic pressure to get the Serbian Government to resolve the case. Even Secretary of State Jim Baker has been involved in the case, making a personal appeal to Mr. Milosevic in June of 1991.

In March, Dragisa Lazarevich's final appeal for custody of the children was exhausted. All of us involved in the case were relieved. However, the sticky problem of transfer of custody of the children to their mother still stood in the way of final resolution.

On March 24th, I wrote Slobodan Milosevic the following letter asking him to ensure that the children be placed in protective custody until Shayna could get them back:

Hon. SLOBODAN MILOSEVIC,
President, Republic of Serbia, Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It has come to my attention that final court in Serbia has acted on the Shayna Lazarevich custody case, and confirmed that custody of the children should be awarded to their mother.

I, therefore, am contacting you to urge that the children be placed in protective custody at the U.S. Embassy in Belgrade until the appeal is closed out, which I understand will take about two weeks.

By all accounts that have come to my attention, the children have been abused in their father's care, and I fear the worst if they remain in his custody during this critical period.

Having demonstrated abusive behavior in the past, Mr. Lazarevich once again could flee with the children, or resist attempts to transfer custody.

Please do all in your power to assure that this does not happen.

Sincerely,

HELEN DELICH BENTLEY,
Member of Congress.

To reinforce my first appeal, On April 1, I also sent the following appeal signed by 14 Members of Congress to President Milosevic:

Hon. SLOBODAN MILOSEVIC,

President, Republic of Serbia, Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It has come to our attention that final court in Serbia has acted on the Shayna Lazarevich custody case and confirmed that custody of the children should be awarded to their mother.

We, the undersigned Members of the United States House of Representatives, would urge you to do the following to ensure a safe return of the children to their mother:

1. Immediately place the children under police protection in the town of Nis, or deliver them to the United States Embassy until the appeal process is completed.

2. Arrange delivery of the children to their mother in Belgrade as quickly as possible, or arrange for her to take custody of them in Nis under full protection of your law enforcement officials.

3. Take any and all precautions that Mr. Lazarevich does not flee the Republic of Serbia or the country with the children in his custody.

We cannot stress enough that these actions be taken immediately, and appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Helen Delich Bentley, Barney Frank, Ronald K. Machtley, Bill Green, Stephen J. Solarz, William E. Dannemeyer, Randy "Duke" Cunningham, Peter H. Kostmayer, Dana Rohrabacher, Jolene Unsoeld, George W. Gekas, Barbara F. Vucanovich, Curt Weldon, William Lehman,

Members of Congress.

After sending these letters, I spoke with both President Milosevic and Deputy Speaker of the Serbian Parliament, Vukasim Jokanovic. Both assured me that the children were being taken care of.

Shayna called me on Monday; her children were not in school. Warren Zimmerman called yesterday morning; the Ministry of Justice told him that Shayna's ex-husband had once again fled with the children, and that she should hire a private detective to find him.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked at this callous answer given by the Serbian Government. This case, involving two American nationals, which had been brought to their attention again and again, gets a simple "not our problem, hire a detective."

Mr. Speaker, I am incensed. Upon hearing that Ms. Lazarevich's ex-husband had fled once again, I wrote to

President Milosevic and Deputy Speaker Jokanovic to voice my disapproval of their inability to act on the case. In addition, Ambassador Zimmerman has contacted President Milosevic and Minister of Justice Cetkovic criticizing their inaction and has also released a statement which I would like to read:

EMBASSY OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
May 7, 1992.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ZIMMERMAN

We are all devastated that the Lazarevich children, Sacha and Andre, have disappeared. The responsibility for this lies squarely on the Serbian Government.

Since the final court ruling in Shayna's favor, the Serbian Government has had 6 weeks in which to organize the recovery of the children.

We don't know if its failure to do so was the result of malice or incompetence. Either way, the Serbian Government will have thereby demonstrated to all Americans its callousness to both the legal and human sides of this tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, if Serbia ever wishes to regain favorable status with the United States, the resolution of this tragic case would be a positive step. I call on the Serbian Government immediately to locate the children and turn them over to their mother. Anything less is a slap in the face of the United States, and is simply unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, there has been a lot of fighting over in Yugoslavia, a lot of finger pointing, a lot of people accusing one another, but there are two pieces that I want to read in connection with that facet of it.

The first is a piece from the Associated Press today. It is datelined Semizovac, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and it is written by Tony Smith, an AP writer.

I guess we could describe this as how people can really get along despite conditions.

The AP article says that—

Nebojsa Spirovic made a screeching U-turn with his white Volkswagen and yelled out of the window: "Run for cover, truce has collapsed, Muslims are attacking."

Within minutes, gun and cannon fire erupted, sending houses up in smoke and Serb and Muslim townfolk scurrying for cover in cellars and barns.

Many found shelter across enemy lines, attesting to the reluctance with which Serbs and Muslims in this ethnically-mixed village of 5,000 have taken up arms against each other in the bloody dispute over Bosnia's independence.

"In half an hour this place will be chaos," said Spirovic, a 28-year-old Serb fighter known as Spiro.

He urged visitors into "a safe place" a hillside machine-gun nest made from logs and black plastic sheets that overlooked the small town just outside the embattled Bosnian capital of Sarajevo.

As the boom of cannon fire rumbled from the capital, mortar shells whistled into a Serb part of Semizovac from a Muslim district across a wooded valley.

A local truce had collapsed.

"I dare not say how stupid this all is," said Spiro, nestled down among half-empty plum

brandy bottles and soiled blankets. "They have guns, we have guns, we shoot."

Members of Spiros' Serbian territorial defense unit said they were fighting to defend their town against "Muslim extremists."

More than 350 people have died in Bosnia since Slavic Muslims and Croats voted for independence on February 29. Serbs, who oppose independence, have been backed by the Serb-dominated federal army in battles for control of territory.

The Serb fighters in Semizovac insisted, however, that they would prefer to return to the tolerance that once characterized Bosnia's melting pot of nationalities and cultures than continue fighting their fellow villagers.

But the harmony that clearly once ruled in the village was abundantly evident, even as Serbs and Muslims fired at each other.

Muslims caught in the cross-fire sought shelter with Serbs and found it there.

"There should be a new referendum, new elections, so that we could all live together like before in our old Yugoslavia," said Milan Dragicevic, a Serb sheltering 35 Muslim refugees in his tiny farmhouse cellar further up the slopes.

"It's no longer a question of politics it's a question of life," he said. His Muslim guests nodded in agreement.

There were no signs of animosity as the gunfire eased and Serbs and Muslims emerged to chat among blossoming apple trees.

Muslim children stole sweets from a Serb granny. One-month-old baby, Milena, was brought from the farmhouse and passed among cooling women of both nationalities. "Can you imagine anything crazier?" asked Spiro. "They were afraid we would attack them, but they run here for cover."

□ 1630

Mr. Speaker, I think that story says more than anything else we could talk about the sad situation that is taking place in the former Republic of Yugoslavia and the remnants of Yugoslavia.

With that, I am preparing a memo that I am going to send to the State Department. It reads something like this, because this story of Spiro's exemplifies how people really feel.

This memo says:

SPECIAL APPEAL TO THE STATE DEPARTMENT

The world, including the European Community, the United Nations, and the United States must realize that Yugoslavia is a mosaic—a conglomeration of ethnic and religious divisions.

These are powerful factors with tremendous impact, if not explosive.

The problems inherent to Yugoslavia are fomenting the current strife, and if not handled properly now, could expand into a catastrophe involving the whole of the Balkan peninsula.

Present actions that favor one group over another and give only lip service to resolution of the rights of minorities offer a problem that merely festers.

This problem cannot be swept under the rug, nor should we believe that these problems will merely pass away. In addition, threats that serve as retaliatory measures against one group or another offer no solution, merely adding to the incentive to avoid a comprehensive solution rather than to stop and comply, especially in the face of policy that is perceived as biased and one-sided.

Therefore we should address the problem where it lies—among the parties, who know

the situation better—and conversely—who know better what issues must be addressed for a permanent and lasting peace.

When the breakup of Yugoslavia began, everyone—the parties involved—thought that each could and would do better without the other. But economic conditions, playing havoc with each group, now have introduced another facet to the overwhelming problems of this area—and indicate that an opportunity exists for the groups to reflect again on the final form of the Balkan breakup.

The groups not only need a meeting of the parties, but they also need a fair arbitrator, extending equal and unbiased treatment to all.

All of the republics of Yugoslavia respect the United States, who has had no historical designs on the area, and therefore, the United States should act as mediator to such a summit.

Mediation will cost the United States nothing; aid, embargoes, sanctions, and peace-keeping forces will cost much more.

It is clear that the United States is the only entity that could facilitate such action to the acceptance of all parties involved.

Contain the problem. Keep it among the parties—at the table and not in the streets, where innocent citizens of all groups are losing their lives.

However, the rights of everyone concerned, without exception, must be addressed; any delay in negotiations will offer no solution.

This is a suggestion that requires immediate and concerted action on the part of the United States.

VACATING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the 60-minute special order earlier agreed to for today for myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOSTMAYER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE EMERGENCY LOAN GUARANTEE ASSISTANCE TO THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce to the Members and to print in the RECORD H.R. 5102, which has just been filed on behalf of the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] and myself, that has as its primary purpose to provide emergency loan guarantee assistance to the city of Los Angeles in helping it to reestablish business in the areas affected by the recent disturbances.

I want to mention that I also have available, and I will place it in the RECORD subsequently, a copy of the report that I printed as a committee and subcommittee document as a result of the hearings which, in the name of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development and the full Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, we held in Los Angeles on Feb-

ruary 10, right in the middle of the center of the storm now, in the building in which the disturbances have taken place all around it.

The report I had printed because what we had by way of testimony at the hearing was clearly very disturbing, and we reported that there was a likelihood of social problems and unrest. That was just February 10.

I am introducing legislation today on behalf of myself and Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, that will begin to address some of the immediate steps needed to rebuild Los Angeles and other communities which have suffered destruction and unrest as a result of the violence fueled by the Rodney King verdict.

This legislation provides an immediate incentive for burned out and looted businesses to reopen, as well as to attract new businesses, in areas of the city that suffered destruction during protests over the not guilty verdict. Specifically, this legislation provides immediate credit for such business activity. It uses the existing section 108 Loan Guarantee Program to make business loans more affordable by lowering the cost of business loans in these areas through interest rate reductions. In addition, this legislation increases the borrowing authority for affected communities so that sufficient funds are available quickly.

This legislation is an immediate step toward addressing a larger and more fundamental problem. While the jury verdict of not guilty catalyzed these destructive protests, the fundamental cause of the violence goes far beyond Rodney King's beating.

Drastic Federal budget cuts during a decade of Reagan-Bush administrations have burdened municipalities so that they can no longer keep citizens from falling through the cracks.

Several field hearings held by the Banking Committee this year, including one in Los Angeles, examined the effects of the decade long neglect by the Federal Government to our inner cities. The situation is dire: families are desperate for good jobs, safe neighborhoods, good schools, and decent housing. Yet cities are unable to afford to provide these basic necessities.

Separate legislation that I introduced and which has been approved by the Committee on Banking, H.R. 4073, will be the next step to more fully address the root causes of the desperation and destruction. This legislation will provide permanent jobs through the rebuilding of critically needed infrastructure improvements.

I will be bringing H.R. 4073 to the floor in the near future. For now, I ask my colleagues to work with Congresswoman WATERS and me to provide this section 108 loan guarantee assistance as quickly as possible.

H.R. 5102

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Gonzalez-Waters Distressed Communities Assistance Act".

SEC. 2. GUARANTEE OF OBLIGATIONS AND NOTES.

Pursuant to the authority provided under section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 and this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may guarantee and make commitments to guarantee the notes and other obligations issued by qualified public entities for the purposes under section 3. The provisions of section 108 and title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 shall apply to any guarantees and commitments for guarantees made pursuant to this Act except to the extent otherwise provided in this Act.

SEC. 3. ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.

Notwithstanding the first sentence of section 108(a) of the Housing Act of 1974, guarantees may be provided under this Act only for notes and other obligations issued for the purposes of financing activities for the establishment, development, and redevelopment of businesses in qualified areas, including acquisition of property located within qualified areas for businesses, providing working capital and capital for start-up costs and inventory, and acquisition, construction, reconstruction, and rehabilitation of structures located within qualified areas for businesses.

SEC. 4. QUALIFIED AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this Act, the term "qualified area" means any area—

(1) in which a public disturbance involving acts of violence occurred on or after April 29, 1992, and before May 6, 1992;

(2) in which significant property damage was caused by such public disturbance; and

(3) that is described in a certification approved under subsection (b) by the Secretary.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Any certification referred to in subsection (a)(3) shall be made by the chief executive officer of a unit of general local government in which the area described in the certification is located. The certification shall be submitted to the Secretary and shall describe the areas within the unit of general local government in which eligible activities financed with the proceeds of notes and obligations guaranteed under this Act are to be carried out, the public disturbance that occurred within the area, and the value or extent of damage resulting from the public disturbance. The Secretary shall approve each certification submitted under this subsection and notify the unit of general local government of such approval within 10 days after receipt (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays), unless the Secretary determines that the certification is materially inaccurate.

SEC. 5. INAPPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF CDBG LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM.

(a) INAPPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 108.—Guarantees and commitments to guarantee made under this Act shall not be subject to the following provisions of section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act:

(1) CREDIT AVAILABILITY TEST.—The second sentence of subsection (a).

(2) AGGREGATE AUTHORITY AND ALLOCATION RULES.—The last 2 sentences of subsection (a).

(3) LIMITATION BASED ON CDBG GRANT AMOUNTS.—Subsection (b).

(4) SECURITY.—Subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (d)(1), subsection (d)(2), and subsection (e).

(5) AGGREGATE AND ENTITY LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (k).

(6) ELIGIBLE PUBLIC ENTITY.—Subsection (o).

(7) TRAINING.—Subsection (p).

(b) INAPPLICABILITY OF LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME REQUIREMENT.—Guarantees and commitments to guarantee made under this Act shall not be subject to section 101(c) and 104(b)(3) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

SEC. 6. ASSISTANCE FOR REDUCTION OF INTEREST PAYMENTS.

Pursuant to the second sentence of section 108(h) and subject to the requirements of such section, there is authorized to be appropriated for grants to qualified public entities such sums as may be necessary to cover interest costs involved in financing activities under section 3.

SEC. 7. GUARANTEE AUTHORITY AND BUDGET COMPLIANCE.

Subject only to the absence of applications from qualified public entities or proposed activities and to the authority provided in this section, in addition to the amount provided under the 5th sentence of section 108(a) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, the Secretary shall enter into commitments to guarantee notes and obligations pursuant to this Act with an aggregate principal amount of \$500,000,000, without fiscal year limitation, to the extent approved or provided in appropriation Acts.

SEC. 8. OTHER DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act:

(1) QUALIFIED PUBLIC ENTITY.—The term "qualified public entity" means any unit of general local government (as such term is defined in section 102 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974) within which a qualified area under section 4 is located, and such term includes any public agency designated by any such unit of general local government.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

SEC. 9. IMPLEMENTATION.

Upon the enactment of any appropriation Act providing guarantee authority under section 7 and to the extent of such authority, the Secretary shall guarantee, and make commitments to guarantee, notes and obligations under this Act, whether or not regulations to carry out this Act have been issued.

AFTERMATH OF THE DISTURBANCE IN LOS ANGELES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I take the well on this occasion to speak on a matter of some urgency to our Nation. I hope not to use the entire 60 minutes. I am mindful of the fact that it has been a long day for all of us, and particularly those who staff the House here, who of course have other important things to do.

Printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 28, 1992, I made a state-

ment on what was then another occasion such as this, a special order, and on that occasion, Mr. Speaker, I made a promise. That promise was, and I quote from page H 2708,

I am recommitted that between now and the end of the term to which the people of the 18th Congressional District have either fortunately or unfortunately elected me to hold, I will, with all the fiber in my body, bring to the attention of the American people on this microphone on a regular basis the problems that we confront as a country, not only as a Democrat, not as a Republican, but as a person who meant it when he held up his hand and took the oath that I would defend with my life the Constitution and the laws of the United States and the people who elected me.

□ 1640

I did not plan that this would be such an occasion so closely following that. But since that time we have had an unfortunate series of tragedies to occur in a part of our Nation which we call Los Angeles and its environs. And it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is both the appropriate place and occasion to speak out on a matter that is important to the American people, for most of us have had the opportunity to on several occasions see the videotape that was providently taken by an amateur video photographer of the police misconduct that was visited upon the person of Rodney King on that fateful evening. And most of us watched with great anticipation, believing in our system of justice, and believing in our Constitution and laws and that justice would be done to one of several persons who in the opinion of most Americans and people throughout the world used more force than was necessary on that occasion to subdue Rodney King and reduce him to arrest.

We all of course know that the jury returned the verdict of not guilty, and that was of course within their province to do. Under the concept of ordered liberty we should not now criticize the verdict from that jury, but we ought to look beyond it, for I believe that much more important than how we feel about the verdict and the aftermath, we as citizens should condemn the violence that brought us to the point where police officers who wear our uniforms and our badges and carry our guns and nightsticks feel that they can, with impunity, be both judge, jury, and executioner for any person charged with crime in our society. It is tragic when police officers feel that way.

In my view, it is also tragic that the jury reached the conclusion that they did, although I do not quarrel with their verdict because only they had both the responsibility and the duty under our law to reach the decision that they did.

I also wish to condemn the violence of the thugs and villains and criminals who took the law into their own hands

in Los Angeles, CA, after the verdict was rendered. I do not think, not speaking for other people because I do not know how other people feel really, I do not think that any of those who have attempted since that time, Mr. Speaker, to explain the frustration and feeling in the hearts of people who may have taken to the streets is an attempt on their part to rationalize or justify what is obviously criminal conduct. What happened in the streets of Los Angeles following the verdict in the Rodney King case was, at least in my view, as wrong as what happened to Rodney King. It was criminal, and it was wrong to beat innocent people, many of whom happened to have been white, who had done absolutely nothing to Rodney King or to cause the conditions that resulted in the verdict. And we as elected officials in this country must set the tone, because if we do not set the tone then the people have no leadership, and we leave it to others who perhaps may not be as thoughtful and perhaps not be as cautious as we should be in fashioning a remedy that comes out of the ashes of the several tragedies that have been visited upon California in the last year and a half, and I am not speaking of the earthquakes.

It was wrong, in my judgment, and criminal, as I say, for the citizens or some of the citizens in Los Angeles to take the law into their own hands and to take out their frustrations, and vent their hostilities on innocent people merely because they happened to have been of another race. And I think that people who are right-thinking people in our country find just as abhorrent the television sight of people pulling unarmed innocent motorists out of a vehicle and beating those people senseless as they were when they saw the videotape of Rodney King being beaten by the police officers.

It seems to me that we must have justice in our society, but it seems that we as a nation ought to look at where we are and where we should be going. And it seems to me, without attempting to lay the blame at the feet of anyone or all of us that the U.S. Government must provide leadership in these times, because I think these are critical times for our country. I do not believe that what happened in Los Angeles or any of the other cities where there was violence or the threat of violence should be fashioned as an isolated incident. As one of my colleagues said, I think it was a wakeup call for the United States of America, and it is time we heed the wakeup call. It is like when you set the clock for a certain time in the morning, and the alarm goes off, and you hit the snooze button, and you give yourself 6 minutes, or 10 minutes, or whatever your clock is programmed to provide of more time to crawl back in bed and snuggle up 1 more minute and sleep a few more min-

utes. Then the clock goes off again and you get up, and you hit the button again, and hopefully at some point you do get up, because otherwise you will be late for your responsibilities. And America is on the verge of being late in meeting its responsibilities, because as far back as 1968, the National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorder, called the Kerner Commission, has given us a blueprint for some of the things that led to the kind of violence that happened on the streets of Los Angeles.

This is not of course to mollify or justify people taking the law into their own hands. But one must understand the conditions of life in the ghetto to understand how a decent human being could be driven to the point of engaging in rioting and looting on the streets of a city where they live. Virtually every major episode of violence in this country has been followed by an accumulation of unresolved grievances and by widespread dissatisfaction of the people with the unwillingness or the inability of the government to properly respond. And there are many people in the Government, from the President of the United States on down, who are now attempting to fashion what is and ought to be our response to very troubling times in Los Angeles and in other American cities.

And it seems to me that we ought to talk to each other, not at each other about the problems that we face as a society. And it seems to me that we ought to look at the root causes not of the violence, because the cause of the violence in the streets of Los Angeles was criminal. The cause of the verdict by the jury in the Rodney King case was that we have allowed our police to become part of a siege mentality in which it is us against them. We who are law-abiding citizens have allowed ourselves to be separated from those who violate our laws, and therefore we have created an us-against-them mentality in which the police see it as their duty to protect us from them. And we reward the thin blue line of police by forgiving, forgiving on too many occasions their violations of our law.

It is not right for a police officer to violate the law, just as it is not right for a citizen to violate the law.

□ 1650

One does not justify the other. So it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we must engage in a dialog, not as Democrats and not as Republicans, but as Americans, on where we are to be heading as a nation and what should be our appropriate and proper response to the chagrin that we all feel from what we watched on television over the last 7 or 8 days.

In the concept of ordered liberty, we as a society must work together to solve our common problems, because the problem of police misconduct is not

the problem of one community but the problem of our entire community, because as surely as what happened to Rodney King, that happened to him, it could happen to any person in the middle of the night who happens to be stopped by a police officer who, for whatever reason, feels that he needs to extract his pound of flesh from another individual. So we need to address, it seems, the underlying problems, not to suggest that those problems gave rise to the specific incident or to excuse or justify the conduct, once again, that has occurred. But if we do not begin now to address the problems, then it is my fear that they will happen again and again and again.

It is those of us who have been elected to public office upon whose watch these things have happened that bear the ultimate responsibility for what has happened and bear the ultimate responsibility for what I believe will happen in the future if we do not begin now the constructive process and the courageous process of addressing these problems in a forthright manner.

In our urban areas, as in our rural areas in this country, we suffer from benign neglect, and I intend to focus my remarks on this occasion on how we can address these problems without spending any more money than we are presently spending.

It is good to have a lot of ideas to throw out, and there are lots of people who have ideas. I am sure they are all worth merit, and I am not saying that mine are worth anything at all except perhaps to start other people with greater minds thinking about how we can address these problems.

We have a problem with the education of our young people in this country. I do not know the people who were rioting and looting on the streets of Los Angeles. I watched television, and they appeared to be of all racial and ethnic groups and of all ages, and it seems to me that if we had a composite of those people, it is my view, Mr. Speaker, that most of them would not have received the benefit of the educational opportunities that our society and our country have so richly provided to the fortunate few. It seems to me that if we are to ensure that there are no more Los Angeleses in our country that we must, as a Congress and as a country, be about the business of addressing in a forthright and direct manner answers to these questions.

How is it that we do not educate our young people? Why do we allow so many of our young people to drop out of school and be pushed out of school before they even get a high school education? What chance does a person without a high school education have of succeeding in our society? Most often they become a ward of the State, either as prisoners in our prison system or caught up in our welfare system. They become homeless because

they do not have jobs and cannot provide housing for themselves and their families.

It seems to me the response of the Congress of the United States should be on this occasion to step back and look at these problems and attempt to address them in a forthright and direct manner, and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, Members, that we must first look at how we spend our dollars and, once again, I reiterate that these proposals have nothing to do with new taxes upon our overly taxed people in our country already, but the reallocation of our priorities.

When the Congress passed our budget for the next fiscal year in which we outlined our budget as being \$1.4 trillion, the verdict in Los Angeles has not occurred, and Simi Valley had not occurred, and the violence in Los Angeles had not taken place. So the question is: Do we have the courage to then reorder our priorities, having made a commitment for that budget, and is there an urgent necessity to do so?

It seems to me that there is an urgent necessity to do so, because conditions have changed. Mr. Speaker, I would liken it to the budget of a household or of a family or of a corporation. When you sit down and you think about the requirements of the budget for the following year, you take into consideration what your expectations are for the following year, not only for the expenditures but the happenstance of events then and in the future.

No one could project either the outcome of the criminal trial in Simi Valley nor the response from the community in Los Angeles and other places of this country at the time that the Congress in its wisdom decided that we would allocate the funds in the fashion that we did. Following that debate, as the Members of Congress and as the Nation will recall, we undertook a debate on whether the so-called firewalls should be removed.

The people in the country will recall that out of the budget summit of 1990 the Congress attempted to give itself the discipline to balance the budget in this country by the year 2000, and the method by which we accomplished that, or purported to accomplish that, was the bill, the so-called firewalls between domestic discretionary, domestic entitlement, and military spending.

Now, that may have been appropriate at the time, and I assume that it was, because the Congress, in its wisdom, decided that those would be our priorities.

But just as a household has to reorder its priorities in light of a tragedy that occurs in the household, it seems to me that now is the time for the Congress to reorder its priorities with respect to the budget of our Nation. We must turn our attention to our American cities, not turn our back on our foreign friends and neighbors in South

America and in Canada, in Europe and Japan, but to redirect our priorities to the places where it is clearly evident that our priorities ought to be focused.

A new world order must now include American cities. A new world order must include redeveloping the infrastructure of American cities not because of the events of the past week or so but because of what has been happening to this country for the last 30 years.

We have been in a steady decline and erosion of our American cities. As pointed out in the Kerner Commission report of 1968, "But for the precipitous causes of the summer of 1967," and the changing of the name of Newark and Detroit and a few other neighboring cities, and the changing of terminology from Negro to African-American or black, whichever a person chooses to use or some of the other matters that have been changed in our society, I suggest that anyone who reads either the excerpts or the full report from the Kerner Commission, merely by inserting Los Angeles instead of some of the other cities, we would think that this report was written within the last 7 days.

When are we going to wake up to the reality that every time we have a very great tragedy in America we do not need another study? We do not need to study what happened in Los Angeles. Mr. Speaker, we need to study the reports that we have already paid for that are gathering dust over on the shelves of the Library of Congress, because if we read those reports and heed the advice and wisdom contained therein by many scholars and experts who have put their minds to the task, then it seems to me that we would be directed toward what we ought to do as a nation.

From the summary, just let me read a part:

Recommendations for national action: Employment: Pervasive unemployment and underemployment are the most persistent and serious grievances in minority areas. They are inextricably linked to the problems of civil disorder. Despite growing Federal expenditures for manpower development and training programs and sustained general economic prosperity and increasing demand for skilled workers, about 2 million white and nonwhite are permanently unemployed; about 10 million are underemployed, of whom 6.5 million work full time for wages below the poverty line.

None of that has changed.

□ 1700

The 500,000 hardcore unemployed, that has changed. It is about 3 million hardcore unemployed now.

In the central cities, those who lack a basic education and are unable to hold a steady job are made up in large part of Negro males, now Afro-American males, many of whom are now in prison instead of on the streets of America between the ages of 18 and 25,

I would add parenthetically, many of whom now experience the fact that the leading cause of death among that age group, that is 18 to 25, is now homicide.

In the large cities which we surveyed, Negroes were three times as likely as whites to hold unskilled jobs, which were often part-time seasonal low-paying and dead-end jobs. Nothing has changed about those things.

This was 25 years ago, Mr. Speaker, that these things were brought to the attention of the Congress, of which most of us were not Members at the time, and of the American people.

Nothing has been done to move us in the direction in which we should now move.

If we had a household in which priorities in budget had been established and it was such that that budget had been put into action and all of a sudden that household experienced a catastrophe, such as little Johnny coming in from playing in the backyard on a swing set with his arm severed, and little Johnny went to the hospital, you would not need an x ray or an MRI to find out that little Johnny's arm was broken.

We do not need another study to know that little Johnny's arm is broken. Little Johnny is Los Angeles today, but it could be Chicago or Houston or Miami or Detroit or Washington or New York or any other major city in America tomorrow. We do not need another study, it seems to me, to know what is wrong with America.

America has spent too many of its resources, and with the benefit of hindsight, not so much in criticism of what we have done, but of where we are. We have spent our resources rebuilding Japan and Germany after World War II, and we did wonderful work there. There is nothing wrong with that; but in the budget of \$1.4 trillion, we neither reduced the deficit to the point where we get to a balanced budget, nor do we address the fundamental underlying cancer that grows on the conscience of America.

It seems to me that we do not need an x ray or an MRI to look at the situation in Los Angeles under a microscope, Mr. Speaker, to know what the nature of the problem is. It is the same as it was in 1968 and in 1967 when we had riots all over this country.

We have too many people who are unemployed. We have too many people who are uneducated and undereducated. We have too many people with no health care. We have too many people with no housing or inadequate housing. We have too many people who subsist on welfare. We have too many people who understand the conditions of life in the ghettos in the United States. So we must redirect our priorities.

We ought to take the resources, or part of the resources that we are now spending and will spend through the

year 2000, some \$400 billion, that is \$400,000 million that we will spend between now and the year 2000 protecting Germany and Europe from the Soviet Union that wants to join NATO, and protecting Japan from China, while our cities continue to deteriorate, while our cities come apart at the seams, while our young people start the first grade with three of their friends and neighbors from the community and find that of the three of those who graduate from high school, Mr. Speaker, one has a functional equivalency of an eighth grade education and the other dropped out of the eighth grade, while two of those four young people did not receive the value and benefit of the educational resources that we provide.

The Federal Government must provide leadership. The Federal Government is responsible if these problems continue to exist. No one can save us but us.

It is time now for the American people to make the Congress do its duty. The duty of the Congress is to address the problem not of Los Angeles; Los Angeles is only the tip of the iceberg. Los Angeles is only a symptom of the underlying problem. The underlying problem is that we have allowed our infrastructure to erode. We do not spend enough money developing our highways and our sidewalks and the infrastructure of our cities so that we can be proud of them, and as a result most of our citizens who can afford to move out of the cities and move into suburban and rural areas, and on the other end of the spectrum our citizens who live in rural areas find themselves without adequate health care because the doctors are moving from the rural areas into the suburban areas and into the urban areas because they cannot make a living in the rural areas; so rural hospitals are closing all over America and people who are unfortunate enough to need serious trauma care or other serious medical care in the rural areas find themselves having to be transported 200 miles by life-flight helicopters, if they can find one, in order to get the appropriate medical attention.

We are allowing our country to die on the vine.

It does not require any new spending. It requires a new direction and new priorities. We must have the wisdom, we must have the courage to turn our country around. No one can do that but the Congress of the United States and no one can make the Congress of the United States do that but the American people.

It is time for the people who are sitting in their homes tonight, this evening, who are on their way home from work, who are troubled about what is happening in Los Angeles, to realize that there will not be a response from the mayors of the cities

around the Nation or from the county commissioners or county supervisors or State legislators or from the Governors or from the President or from the Congress without some action on their part. They need to turn up the heat on all elected officials, because it is our responsibility to ensure that the new world order that they expect becomes a reality.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the way to accomplish that is to redirect our priorities so that we spend the \$400 billion that we will spend between now and the year 2000 on the people in this country so that we can address the question of AIDS in a forthright and comprehensive manner. AIDS is not a gay disease. It never was. People who thought it was a gay disease are now finding their so-called straight mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers, being afflicted with this dread disease and they are now becoming involved. They should have been involved 6, 8, or 10 years ago, but that is of no moment.

We have low birth weight babies being born all over America, particularly in American cities, because young females do not get prenatal care, Mr. Speaker, they go four term pregnancies, and the first time they see a doctor is when they are in active labor going in to delivery the baby in the hospital.

We need a health care delivery system that addresses the needs of the American people. The people in Germany have a national health care system. The people in Japan have a national health care system and they have it at our expense, because they do not need a standing army to protect them from whatever enemy, real or imagined, exists for them, Mr. Speaker. They have the United States of America to do that for them; but while we do those things for the rest of the world, and there is nothing wrong with doing that, in times of prosperity and better times we can afford to do those things, but we have to tighten the belt. We have to look out for America first. We have to look out for the new world order that exists in this country, when we have frustrated and humiliated young people who have no education, who have no hope, who have no jobs or hopes of a job, who have no health care, who are sleeping on the streets at night. It is no wonder we have violence on the streets.

It seems to me that we need to follow the recommendations of the Kerner Commission. The Commission recommended in the area of education, and again it would seem as if this Commission was done in the last several days.

They recommended sharply increased efforts to eliminate de facto segregation in our schools through substantial Federal aid to the school systems seeking to desegregate either within the system or in cooperation with neighboring school systems.

They recommended elimination of racial discrimination in northern as well as southern schools by vigorous application of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

They recommended extension of quality early childhood education to every disadvantaged child in the country.

They recommended efforts to improve dramatically schools serving disadvantaged children through substantial Federal funding of year-round quality compensatory education programs, improved teaching, and expanded experimentation and research.

They recommended elimination of illiteracy through greater Federal support of adult basic education.

They recommended enlarged opportunities for parents and community participation in public schools. They recommended reoriented vocational education, emphasizing work experience, training, and involvement of business and industry.

They recommended expended opportunities for higher education through increased Federal assistance to disadvantaged students.

□ 1710

They recommended revision of the State aid formulas to ensure more per student aid in districts having a higher proportion of disadvantaged school-age children. It is as if these things were reported on and studied in the last 7 days. Every recommendation mentioned here in 1968 has failed to come to fruition.

Every one of these recommendations could have avoided what happened in Los Angeles and what will happen in other American cities unless we do something about it.

In the area of welfare reform, the Kerner Commission recommended that we establish for recipients of existing welfare categories uniform national standards of assistance at least as high as the annual poverty level of income then set by the Social Security Administration at \$3,335 per year for an urban family of four.

They recommended that we require all States receiving Federal welfare contributions to participate in aid to families with dependent children, unemployed parent programs which permits assistance to both fathers and mothers in the home, thus aiding the family while it is still intact. That is, rather than requiring that there be no father in the home in order to get the assistance, and therefore we wonder why there are so many one-adult-headed household families on AFDC? Because the Federal Government required them to be that way.

Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as a fatherless child, there is no such thing as a fatherless child, not even in artificial insemination.

They recommended that the Federal Government bear a substantially great-

er portion of all welfare costs, at least 90 percent of the total payments. We have not done that. They recommended that we increase incentives for seeking employment and job training, but remove restrictions recently enacted by Congress that will compel mothers of young children to work. What they are talking about is the phenomenon in which mothers who presently receive aid to families with dependent children, Mr. Speaker, now have to make a choice, and it is a Hobson's choice; they have to choose between giving up the benefits of health care, which they have as long as they remain unemployed and on AFDC, and they have small children in the household, that of taking a low-wage job or a lower minimum-wage job for an employer who has no health care benefits.

It would seem to be almost criminal for a mother to do such a thing, knowing the frequency with which young children, especially those who do not receive immunizations—and most of these children are not immunized against the common, everyday childhood illnesses, such as measles and mumps, because they do not see a doctor between the age of 6 months when they lose their mother's natural immunity and the time that they are required to get vaccinated when they start the first grade.

These children are more prone to childhood illnesses, they are more prone to scrapes, and bumps, and broken arms, and things like that. So that the mother is then faced with the Hobson's choice of taking a job at a minimum wage for an employer who has no benefits, no health care benefits, and running the risk that if the child gets injured or has an illness that requires hospitalization or treatment—especially after the hours that the clinics in urban America close, which is about 5 in the afternoon in most urban areas—running the risk of sitting all night at the public hospital, in order that the child can be seen. But the child will not be prioritized above the people who come in with gunshot wounds, automobile accidents, knifing incidents. So it is likely, and it is a regular occurrence for most of these people, to have to spend sometimes all night and sometimes several days in the hospital waiting for the child to be seen. That is the choice when you do not have insurance or that of staying at home and at least having benefits of Medicaid and Medicare.

We, that is, the Federal Government, force them, women in particular, to make that choice. That is what the recommendation in 1968 said. We have done nothing, or very little, to improve upon those conditions since.

They also recommended that we provide more adequate social services through neighborhood centers and family planning programs. Oh, let us not talk about family planning; that is a verboten word around here.

Remove the freeze placed on the 1967 welfare amendment on the percentage of children in the State that can be covered by Federal assistance, eliminate residence requirements; these are recommendations that were made a quarter of a century ago that we have not needed.

These are recommendations that we ought to have been about with respect to housing for people, so that people are not called homeless. Homeless is a nice, kind word for saying to the people that they are not homeless, they are houseless. So we do not want to deal with those people.

So what we have is a situation in this country where we have allowed this sore to fester and grow. It is no wonder that we had the incident that we had in Los Angeles; that is not to condone, once again, for those who might be watching, I do not condone in any way what happened in Los Angeles. But I surely understand what it is like to have no hope.

The last thing we want to do in this country is to take hope away from a vast section of the American people.

So, for those who wish to know and understand what it is that we as a nation can do, what should be our proper response as a civilized society to the tragedies, several in nature, which occurred in Los Angeles, CA, on Wednesday last, and for several days thereafter? We must renew our faith and our dedication to our American values and principles. We must stand shoulder to shoulder to address these problems, and we must make our elected officials not give us lipservice and another study and spend 2 more years and a few dollars working on these programs, for within the budget that we already have we need to redirect our priorities from looking across the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean to looking within the shores of this country from Seattle, WA, to Miami, FL, and from Bangor, ME, to San Diego, CA, crisscrossing this Nation. Mr. Speaker, those are people who need our help. We must provide that help. We must provide it now because the number of people who fit within the category of those who are underrepresented in the Congress of the United States and who are underserved by the resources available in the United States, continue to grow.

As our economy continues in its downward spiral, more and more people are out of work. People who were working 2 years ago are now without a job. They are sleeping in their cars. They sleep on the ground sometimes; they dig holes in the ground because there is not enough room in the shelter.

We must address these problems, and we must address them in a forthright manner. We do not need a study, we do not need a civil rights commission; we do not need any other commission to look at the problem to know what is wrong. We need action by the Congress, and we need it now.

It will not cost any more money than we were already planning to spend over the next biennium or the next 8 years between now and the year 2000. All it takes is the will and the courage to say that we will reduce the military budget and we will look carefully at all of the items currently in the budget because we did not know, we could not assume that what has happened in Los Angeles would happen, but it did.

Ours is the duty of ensuring that we do something about it. So, it seems to me the new world order must include a commitment to preserving peace as our first responsibility of Government. And there is no peace where there is no justice, and where there is no justice there will always be violence; there will be violence in American cities—and I hope I am wrong—unless we do something to address the underlying conditions that confront us as a nation.

Now, some will say that such remarks appear to be nothing more than whining, that one who is a part of the underclass is whining about what we have not accomplished in this country.

Mr. Speaker, we have to reform the education system and the health care system, not for people like myself but for those whom we saw on television on the streets of Los Angeles, because there are a lot of them.

You see, Mr. Speaker, they had crime in Los Angeles before the Rodney King verdict came in. The people in that community learned to live with crime on a daily basis, unfortunately. They continue to live with crime.

Mr. Speaker, the senior citizens locked themselves in their houses. Their houses became prisons for them because they have to lock the criminals out, so they end up locking themselves in with burglar bars on their houses.

We have not provided an adequate response. We have not provided an opportunity to improve the quality of life for the senior citizens in our country. We have not provided a Marshall plan for the American cities. We have not moved boldly to put funds into reducing crime in American cities. We pass a lot of criminal laws, a lot more people are in prison, ending up costing the American taxpayers more and more money, because it costs \$40,000 a year to lock one of those criminals up in prison. But we do not spend that much money on the victim of the crime, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1720

Mr. Speaker, we need to be about the business of redirecting the priorities of this Nation, and we are the people who have the responsibility to do that. Unless we do, then we will always have conditions that lend themselves to the frustration and violence that we saw both in action to the police officers who visited their hostilities upon Rod-

ney King and in the actions of the jury who felt afraid of the Rodney Kings of the world and felt it was us against them, and they wanted to protect the police officers to ensure that the police officers would do their duty on behalf of the American people. So, we give the police officers the benefit of the doubt even when we watch it on television and we see blow, after blow, after blow administered to this human being who is lying on the ground. We would not have allowed a citizen or a police officer to beat a German shepherd like Rodney King was beaten on the ground in Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, most good-thinking people in this country would have attempted to stop another citizen, or even a police officer, from beating a dog like they beat Rodney King, but Rodney King is not the problem. It is the mindset that we have in this country that is the problem that allows people to think that they can get away with doing that to another human being and allows a jury to think that we would justify, that American people would justify that, but they have been wrong because all the polls that have been taken have indicated that across this land people have spoken out against and feel very strongly about what happened in Los Angeles. And, if we allow it to be swept under the rug and allow that to be the end of it, then it will happen again tonight in some American city, and it will happen again tomorrow and the day after.

Mr. Speaker, we must have the courage as a Congress to stand up and do what is right, and what is right is to put money into law enforcement, put money into training law enforcement officers so that they will understand that they have the responsibility of arresting the criminals in the society, but they are not to be the judges, and the jury, and the executioners of the criminals they catch. We expect them to take them to jail. That is the end of their responsibility. We must infuse money into education, and health care, and employment, and preventing drugs from coming into this country, and reducing crime on our streets, and providing housing for all of our people, and cleaning up our environment, and redeveloping our infrastructure, and we can do that without spending one additional dollar over what we will spend between now and the year 2000, while at the same time significantly reducing the deficit.

If only we have the will and we have the courage to do that, then what we have to do in order to do that, Mr. Speaker, is to go back and take down the walls that exist between the budget, the discretionary spending, and the military spending. When we passed that budget in 1990, we did not know that the Berlin Wall would come down, but we erected another wall in its place. When we passed that budget in

1990, we did not know that the conditions would continue to fester as they have in American cities, such as they are reaching a boiling point. When we passed that budget in 1990, we did not know that the new world order was in this country and not in the rest of the world.

We need to be about the business of cleaning up our own house, Mr. Speaker, and we must begin by reorganizing our priorities, and our priorities must be to put America first. When we do that, when we address the findings of the Kerner Commission report, then we will be able to sleep well at night, and we will have done the best that we can for the American people.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PASTOR (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GALLEGLY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMERSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, for 60 minutes, on May 12.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MAZZOLI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WASHINGTON, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 60 minutes, on May 12.

Mr. THORNTON, for 60 minutes, on May 12.

Mr. SCHEUER, for 60 minutes, each day on May 12, 13, and 14.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PURSELL.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. GREEN of New York.

Mr. MCEWEN.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. GALLO.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. MOLINARI.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. GRADISON.

Mr. KOLBE in two instances.

Mr. MACHTELEY.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MAZZOLI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOYER.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. KACHORSKI.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

Mr. WAXMAN.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. REED.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

Mr. LANCASTER.

Mr. WYDEN.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York in six instances.

Mr. TRAXLER.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 466. Joint resolution designating April 26, 1992, through May 2, 1992, as "National Crime Victims' Rights Week"; and

H.J. Res. 430. Joint resolution to designate May 4, 1992, through May 10, 1992, as "Public Service Recognition Week".

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3. An act to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a voluntary system of spending limits and benefits for congressional election campaigns, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) under its previous order the House adjourned until Monday, May 11, 1992, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3465. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the bi-

monthly report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus problem, including any relevant reports from the Secretary General of the United Nations covering the second half of October and all of November and December 1991, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3466. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Peter Barry Teeley, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Canada, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3467. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Robert L. Barry, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Indonesia; of Reginald Bartholomew, of the District of Columbia, to be the United States Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; of Adrian A. Basora, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador to the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, and members of their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3468. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, Legislative Affairs, transmitting the texts of ILO Convention No. 172 and Recommendation No. 179 concerning working conditions in hotels, restaurants, and similar establishments as adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 78th session, at Geneva, June 25, 1991, pursuant to article 19 of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3469. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on claims for loss of property incident to service, pursuant to Public Law 101-138, section 154 (105 Stat. 674); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3470. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1991, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3471. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1991, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3472. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3473. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3474. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3475. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty

payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3476. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a report on the status of research and development activities during fiscal year 1991 and actual and anticipated obligation of funds in accordance with the Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 5107; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

3477. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on findings and recommendations of the North Carolina Environmental Sciences Review Panel, pursuant to Public Law 101-380, section 6003; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 452. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4111) to amend the Small Business Act to provide additional loan assistance to small businesses, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-515). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCURDY:

H.R. 5095. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1993 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 5096. A bill to supersede the Modification of Final Judgment entered August 24, 1982, in the antitrust action styled United States versus Western Electric, civil action No. 82-0192, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 5097. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve benefits in certain education and employment programs for veterans, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, Education and Labor, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Armed Services.

H.R. 5098. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to allow members of the Selected Reserve to use educational assistance for graduate programs; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DAR-

DEN, Mr. SHARP, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida):

H.R. 5099. A bill to provide for the restoration of fish and wildlife and their habitat in the Central Valley of California, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. PEASE, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. ECKART):

H.R. 5100. A bill to strengthen the international trade position of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DREIER of California:

H.R. 5101. A bill to provide eligibility for small business concerns employing socially and economically disadvantaged individuals to participate in Federal procurement programs, and for other purposes; to the committee on Small business.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 5102. A bill to authorize emergency loan guarantee assistance in connection with section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 for developing and reestablishing businesses in areas affected by certain civil disturbances during April and May of 1992, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 5103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt medical benefits from the restrictions on welfare benefit funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

H.R. 5104. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax to defense contractors for expenses of retraining their employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHANDLER (for himself, Mr.

YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. PARKER, Mr. HERGER, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH):

H.R. 5105. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to ensure adequate analysis before application of requirements and prohibitions under that act to a species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOWNEY (for himself and Mr. MCGRATH):

H.R. 5106. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to disregard months during which a retiree is a former employee and covered under a group health plan of an employer for purposes of calculating the penalty for late enrollment under part B of such title; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FAZIO:

H.R. 5107. A bill to establish a program in the Department of Defense to promote electric vehicle and infrastructure development; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 5108. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that dislocated defense workers are eligible for the targeted jobs credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 5109. A bill to assist community, business, and worker readjustment required as a

result of the closure of military installations and reductions in defense spending; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Education and Labor, and Small Business.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. MORRISON):

H.R. 5110. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act with respect to public health pesticides; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KOLBE:

H.R. 5111. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to the Casa Malpais National Historic Landmark in Springerville, AZ; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LOWERY of California:

H.R. 5112. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that an employee shall not be excluded from the minimum wage and maximum hour exemption for certain employees because the employee is not paid on a salary basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUKEN:

H.R. 5113. A bill to abolish the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 5114. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for a portion of child support payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MOODY):

H.R. 5115. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require physicians not participating in the Medicare Program to refund amounts paid for physicians' services by individuals enrolled under part B of the program in excess of the limiting charges applicable to such services, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. OAKAR:

H.R. 5116. A bill to continue and expand programs to assist defense workers and communities adversely affected by base closures or reductions in defense spending, promote the conversion of defense contractors, including defense contractors that are small businesses, and encourage exports of U.S. products and services; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Education and Labor, Small Business, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS of Utah (for himself and Mr. BROOMFIELD):

H.R. 5117. A bill to prohibit United States assistance to Serbia and Montenegro; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS of Utah:

H.R. 5118. A bill to exchange lands within the State of Utah, between the United States and the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 5119. A bill to authorize the construction of the Cumberland Mountain Trail in the States of Kentucky and Virginia, to study the establishment of the Cumberland National Recreation Area in the States of Kentucky and Virginia, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

By Mr. WEISS:

H.R. 5120. A bill to establish an Intergovernmental Commission on Health Care Fraud

and Abuse; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 5121. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to establish citizens advisory boards for Department of Energy nuclear weapons facilities and to require the Administrator of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to conduct public health assessments of such facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 5122. A bill relating to the settlement of the water rights claims of the Jicarilla Apache Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

H.R. 5123. A bill to improve the collection of child support; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 5124. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for regulation by the Federal Trade Commission of advertisements by air carriers, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KLUG, Mr. PAXON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. VALENTINE):

H.R. 5125. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to expand the requirement that legislation be accompanied by cost estimates of its impact on State and local governments; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. VENTO (for himself, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. DOOLITTLE):

H.R. 5126. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the beginning of the protection of Civil War Battlefields, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH:

H.R. 5127. A bill to designate the U.S. courthouse and Federal building to be constructed at the southeastern corner of Liberty and South Virginia Streets in Reno, NV, as the "Bruce R. Thompson United States Courthouse and Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HOLLOWAY:

H.J. Res. 480. Joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Health Care Benefits Expansion Act of 1992; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM:

H.J. Res. 481. Joint resolution designating May 1992 as "Older Americans Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McNULTY (for himself and Mr. HORTON):

H.J. Res. 482. Joint resolution designating June 14, 1992, as "National Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag Centennial Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

H. Res. 453. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the need to increase budget authority for the reduction of violent crime, the rehabilitation of American youth, and the revitalization of American cities; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Education and Labor, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

414. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Maine, relative to the legal availability of RU-486 for appropriate research and, if indicated, clinical practice; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PICKETT:

H.R. 5128. A bill to authorize a certificate of documentation for the vessel *Reddy Jane*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 5129. A bill for the relief of Thomas L. Bowers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. ROEMER, Mr. WASHINGTON, and Mr. HAYES of Louisiana.

H.R. 23: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LENT, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 300: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 528: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 617: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 645: Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 784: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 911: Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 917: Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 1126: Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 1181: Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 1430: Mr. MACHTELY.

H.R. 1468: Mr. ROGERS and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 1692: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1820: Mr. MANTON and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2164: Mr. MORAN, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. GLICKMAN, and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 2200: Mr. McMILLAN of Maryland.

H.R. 2255: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 2258: Mr. ATKINS and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2840: Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 2966: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 3051: Mrs. LOWEY of New York and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 3082: Ms. HORN.

H.R. 3373: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. NOWAK.

H.R. 3838: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 3864: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 3871: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. AUcoin, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. WOLF, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. BACCHUS.

H.R. 3927: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 3989: Ms. OAKAR.
H.R. 3992: Ms. OAKAR.
H.R. 4002: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 4008: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 4089: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. TAUZIN.
H.R. 4175: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4206: Mr. WELDON and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4234: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 4272: Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. OWENS of Utah.
H.R. 4399: Mr. LEHMAN of California and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 4414: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. GEJDENSON.
H.R. 4416: Mr. ROSE and Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan.
H.R. 4435: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BARNARD, and Mr. MOODY.
H.R. 4476: Mr. BOEHNER.
H.R. 4537: Mr. PERKINS.
H.R. 4542: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. LEVINE of California.
H.R. 4613: Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 4706: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4725: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 4748: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 4750: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4885: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 4902: Mr. LANCASTER and Mr. ROGERS.
H.R. 4905: Mr. SIKORSKI and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 4924: Mr. AUCOIN.
H.R. 4957: Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. SOLOMON.
H.R. 4991: Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. HORN.
H.R. 5014: Mr. SYNAR, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.
H.R. 5019: Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.
H.R. 5069: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.
H.J. Res. 81: Mr. MCCREY.
H.J. Res. 271: Mr. HUBBARD.
H.J. Res. 378: Mr. FORD of Michigan.
H.J. Res. 385: Mr. ENGEL.
H.J. Res. 411: Mr. POSHARD.
H.J. Res. 426: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.J. Res. 442: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HUTTO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. MCILLAN of North Carolina, and Ms. PELOSI.
H.J. Res. 445: Mrs. MINK, Mr. HANSEN, Ms. DELAURE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. LANCASTER, Ms.

NORTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PRICE, and Mr. MINETA.
H.J. Res. 470: Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.J. Res. 479: Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. DELAURE, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. LAUGHLIN.
H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. ZELIFF.
H. Con. Res. 180: Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. SAWYER.
H. Con. Res. 210: Mr. HERGER.
H. Con. Res. 233: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SCHAEFFER, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. LAROCO, and Mr. RAVENEL.
H. Con. Res. 246: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. AUCOIN, and Mr. GAYDOS.
H. Con. Res. 299: Mr. JONES of Georgia and Mr. SWETT.
H. Res. 370: Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. WALSH, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. ZELIFF.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4750: Mr. MURPHY.